00022898

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY

Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

A BOOK

OF

Parliamentary Anecdote.

Compiled from Authentic Sources,

BY

G. H. JENNINGS AND W. S. JOHNSTONE.

22898

"I love anecdotes. I fancy mankind may come, in time, to write all aphoristically, except in narrative; grow weary of preparation and connection."—DR. JOHNSON.

CASSELL, PETTER, AND GALPIN,
LONDON, PARIS, AND NEW YORK.

00022898

PREFACE.

In the following pages an attempt has been made to bring together for the first time, in the form of anecdote, some of the more striking facts in the history of our Parliaments and the public lives of distinguished statesmen. As the value of such anecdote must mainly depend upon its authenticity, the compilers have gone for their material only to sources of established repute, appending in each case the authority from which the facts are quoted. It would have been a comparatively easy task to collect a mass of unauthenticated incidents, but the result would have been worthless in proportion to the facility of the undertaking. To interest and amuse is but a part of the aim of the book. It is also designed to furnish information of a useful character, and to form a reliable work of reference; and it is hoped these objects have been in some degree secured.

The public career of living statesmen, and of those lately deceased has been sparingly dealt with. State-

ments respecting recent events are more frequently disputed than matters which have passed into the domain of history; and, moreover, the narration, in such cases, of incidents which belong to the region of mere party feeling has been thought undesirable.

In the Index will be found references to a number of the celebrated expressions which have become political household words. Some of these not given in the Personal division of the book have been included in the Miscellaneous section.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

PAGE

ILLUSTRATIONS OF PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY .. . 1

PART II.

PERSONAL ANECDOTES 5

PART III.

MISCELLANEOUS ANECDOTES 315

A BOOK OF

PARLIAMENTARY ANECDOTE.

PART I.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY.

ANTIQUITY OF PARLIAMENTS.—Parliaments, or General Councils, are coeval with the kingdom itself. How those Parliaments were constituted and composed is another question, which has been matter of great dispute among our learned antiquaries, and, particularly, whether the Commons were summoned at all; or, if summoned, at what period they began to form a distinct assembly. * * * In the main, the constitution of Parliament, as it now stands, was marked out so long ago as the seventeenth year of King John, A.D. 1215, in the great charter granted by that prince; wherein he promises to summon all archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and greater barons, personally; and all other tenants-in-chief under the Crown, by the sheriff and bailiffs, to meet at a certain place, with forty days' notice, to assess aids and scutages when necessary. And this constitution has subsisted in fact at least from the year 1266 (49 Henry III.), there being still extant writs of that date to summon knights, citizens, and burgesses to Parliament.—*Blackstone's Commentaries.*

"England can never be Ruined but by a Parliament."—It was a known apothegm of the great Lord Treasurer Burleigh that "England could never be ruined but by a Parliament;" and, as Sir Matthew Hale observes, this being the highest and greatest court, over which none other can have jurisdiction in the kingdom, if by any means a misgovernment should any way fall upon it, the subjects of this kingdom are left without all manner of remedy. To the same purpose Montesquieu—though, I trust, too hastily—presages that as Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberty and perished, so the constitution of England will, in time, lose its liberty—will perish: it will perish whenever the legislative power shall become more corrupt than the executive.—*Ibid.*

The First Parliament after the Conquest.—A Parliament was elected and called together in the fourth year of William I. (1070). Twelve representatives were elected in each county in the whole kingdom, and were sworn before the King. In this Parliament the laws of Edward the Confessor were adopted and confirmed.—*Oldfield's "History of the House of Commons."*

The Mad Parliament.—In the year 1258, on April 10th, a Parliament met at London, which was called *insanum Parliamentum.* Simon Montford, Earl of Leicester, complained very boldly to the King (Henry III.), appealing to the Parliament for justice; upbraided the King that he promoted and enriched strangers, and despised and wasted his own people; neglected his subjects that faithfully served him, as he had charged the King six years before; that he had not performed his promise of rewarding him for his services and expenses in Gascoigny. To which the King answered, that he would not stand to any promise made to one that proved a traitor. The earl told the King he lied, and, were he not a King, he would make him eat his words. —*Gurdon's "History of Parliament."*

The Parliament de la Bond.—One of Edward II.'s Parliaments (1321) was called "Parliament *de la Bond*," from the barons coming to Parliament armed against the two Spencers, wearing coloured bands upon their sleeves for distinction.—*Ibid.*

The Wonderful Parliament.—The Parliament which was summoned in the eleventh year of Richard II. (Feb. 3rd, 1388) has been called by some historians "the Parliament that wrought wonders;" by others, "the Merciless Parliament." In it articles of high treason were exhibited against the King's ministers, who were, accordingly, sentenced to death or banishment.—*Parry's "Parliaments of England."*

The Lack-learning Parliament.—Speaking of this Parliament, which assembled in 1404, Lord Campbell, in his "Lives," says, the recklessness of the Commons may have arisen from their not having had a single lawyer among them. Lord Chancellor Beaufort, in framing the writs of summonses, illegally inserted a prohibition that "no apprentice or other man of the law should be elected." * * * In return for such a slight our law books and historians have branded this Parliament with the name of *Parliamentum indoctum*, or the "lack-learning Parliament."

The Parliament of Bats.—In the 4th of Henry VI. (1426), a Parliament was summoned to meet at Leicester, and orders were sent to the members that they should not wear swords, so they came to the Parliament (like modern butchers) with long staves, from whence the Parliament got the name of "the Parliament of Bats." And when the bats were prohibited, the members had recourse to stones and leaden plummets.—*Gurdon's "History of Parliament."*

The Diabolical Parliament.—In the 38th year of Henry VI. (1460), a Parliament was summoned to meet on the 20th November, at Coventry. It was there enacted that all such knights of any county as were returned to the

Parliament by virtue of the King's letters, without any other election, should be good, and that no sheriff, for returning them, should incur the pain therefore provided in the Act of the 23rd of Henry VI. And as to the Upper House, the lords of the house of York, then allies and friends, were in a great measure neglected. The Queen and her party carried all before them in this Parliament, which, from its works, was called *Parliamentum diabolicum.—Ibid.*

The Long Parliament.—The Long Parliament, or the fifth of Charles I., assembled November 3, 1640—"a Parliament which many, before that time, thought would never have had a beginning, and afterwards that it would never have had an end." It was, however, abruptly and violently dispersed by Cromwell, April 19th, 1653. He came with a body of soldiers (says the "Parliamentary History"), and entering the House in a furious manner, bid the Speaker leave his chair; told the House that they had sat long enough, unless they had done more good; that some of them were whoremasters (looking then to Henry Martyn and Sir Peter Wentworth), that others of them were drunkards, and some corrupt and unjust men, and scandalous to the profession of the Gospel; and that it was not fit they should sit as a Parliament any longer, and desired them to go away. The Speaker not stirring from his seat, Colonel Harrison, who sat near the chair, rose up and took him by the arm, to remove him from his seat, which, when the Speaker saw, he left his chair. Cromwell bid one of the soldiers take away that fool's bauble, the mace, and stayed himself to see all the members out of the house, himself the last, and then caused the house to be locked up. The next day there was a paper by somebody posted upon the Parliament House door, thus: "This House is to be Lett, now Unfurnished." After various vicissitudes a bill was read a third time for "Dissolving the Parliament begun and holden at Westminster 3rd of November, 1640, and that

the day of dissolution shall be from this day, March 16th, 1659." Macaulay describes it as "that renowned Parliament which, in spite of many errors and disasters, is justly entitled to the reverence and gratitude of all who, in any part of the world, enjoy the blessings of constitutional government." On the other hand, Cobbett, in his "Parliamentary History," observes, "Thus ended the Long Parliament, which, with innumerable alterations and several intermissions, had continued the scourge of the nation for nearly twenty years."

Pride's Purge.—When the Commons were to meet on Dec. 6th, 1648, Hume says, Colonel Pride, formerly a drayman, environed the House with two regiments, and, directed by Lord Grey of Groby, he seized in the passage forty-one members of the Presbyterian party, and sent them to a low room, which passed by the appellation of "hell," whence they were afterwards carried to several inns. Above 160 members more were excluded, and none were allowed to enter but the most furious and the most determined of the Independents; and these exceeded not the number of fifty or sixty. This invasion of the Parliament commonly passed under the name of "Colonel Pride's Purge," so much was the nation disposed to make merry with the dethroning of those members who had violently arrogated the whole authority of government, and deprived the King of his legal prerogatives. The remains of the Parliament were called the "Rump."

The Rump.—"The nickname originated," says Isaac D'Israeli, "in derision on the expulsion of the majority of the Long Parliament by the usurping minority. * * * The collector of 'The Rump Songs' tells us, 'If you asked who named it *Rump*, know 'twas so styled in an honest sheet of prayer called the Bloody Rump, written before the trial of our late sovereign; but the word obtained not universal notice till it flew from the mouth of Major-General

Brown, at a public assembly in the days of Richard Cromwell.'"

Barebone's Parliament.—This Parliament, summoned by Cromwell, met for the first time July 4th, 1653. Hume says, "Among the fanatics of the House there was an active member much noted for his long prayers, sermons, and harangues. He was a leather-seller in London, his name Praise-God Barebone. This ridiculous name, which seems to have been chosen by some poet or allegorist to suit so ridiculous a personage, struck the fancy of the people, and they commonly affixed to the assembly the appellation of 'Barebone's Parliament.'"

Parliamentary Hostages.—In the sixth year of King John (1205), a Parliament was held, at which the children of the barons were required as hostages for their allegiance. —*Oldfield's History.*

An Unwise Counsellor.—Henry III., being straitened for money, issued a warrant ordering the nobles to meet him in London. Accordingly, on the day of St. Hilary, 1237, a countless multitude proceeded to the palace at Westminster to hear the King's pleasure. Having heard with consternation the royal demand for a thirtieth of all movable property, they were about to retire for the purpose of consultation, when Gilbert Bassett said to Henry, in the hearing of all, "My lord King, send some one of your friends to be present at the conference of your barons." In reply to his speech, Richard Percy said, "What is it, friend Gilbert, that you said? Are we, too, foreigners; and are we not among the number of the King's friends?" And Gilbert felt himself rebuked for his unpleasant speech.—*Matthew Paris.*

Selection of Partial Parliaments.—In ancient times it was ordinary for kings to make a show of sum-

moning Parliaments, whenas properly they were but parliamentary meetings of some such lords, clergy, and others as the King saw most convenient to drive on his own designs; and therefore we find that Henry III., about the latter part of his reign, when his government drew towards the dregs, he having in the kingdom two hundred and fifty baronies, he summoned unto one of these parliamentary meetings but five-and-twenty barons and one hundred and fifty of his clergy.—*Nathaniel Bacon's "Discourse on the Government of England."*

Neglect of the King's Summons to Parliament.—Edward III., being troubled with a quarrel between the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York, concerning superiority in bearing the cross, and the important affairs of Scotland so urging, summoned a Parliament at York, which was fain to be delayed and adjourned for want of appearance, and more effectual summons issued forth; but at the day of adjournment none of the clergy of the province of Canterbury would be there; and upon this occasion the Parliament was not only interrupted in their proceedings, but an ill precedent was made for men to be bold with the King's summons in such cases as liked not them; and thereupon a statute was made to enforce obedience upon citizens and burgesses, and such ecclesiastics as held *per baroniam.* * * * Nor did Edward III. ever after hold the presence of the prelates at so high repute at such meetings; and therefore summoned them, or so many of them as he thought meet for the occasion—sometimes more, sometimes fewer; and at a Parliament in his forty-and-seventh year he summoned only four bishops and five abbots. Albeit the clergy still made their claim of vote, and desired the same to be entered upon record.—*Ibid.*

Representation an Expensive Luxury.—A correspondent of *Notes and Queries* (Third Series) writes:—"Whatever estimate the people of the present day may put

upon the elective franchise, it would seem that our ancestors held the privilege very lightly; for although the wages to be received by members of Parliament were fixed by the 16th of Edward II. at the low rate of 4s. a day for a knight of the shire, and 2s. for a citizen or burgess, yet we are told by Prynne that many boroughs petitioned to be excused from sending members to Parliament, on account of the expense; and in a note to "Blackstone" we learn that from the 33rd Edward III., uniformly through the five succeeding reigns, the Sheriff of Lancashire returned that there were no cities or boroughs in his county that ought or were used, or could, on account of their poverty, send any citizens or burgesses to Parliament. There were some instances where even a less sum than that established by statute was allowed; and it is on record that in 1463 Sir John Strange, the member for Dunwich, agreed to take a cade and half a barrel of herrings as a composition for his wages."

A Member Suing for his Wages.—Mr. Hall, member for Grantham, having published a book in 1580, which gave offence to the House, was ordered to be expelled, fined, and imprisoned. On the 21st of November, 1586, Mr. Markham, then member for Grantham, informed the House, on the part of the inhabitants of that borough, that Mr. Arthur Hall, at one time their member, had brought a writ for his wages (amongst other times) for his attendance at the late session of Parliament, holden at Westminster in the twenty-seventh year of the Queen, during which time he did not serve in the House. A committee appointed by the House desired him to remit the said wages, which he did "freely and frankly."—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

Safety and Quietude for Members.—A Parliament was summoned by Edward III. to meet at Westminster, March 12th, 1332, reciting in the summons the King's reasons for calling them. Where—that we may see (says Joshua Barnes) what prudent care was then taken by these august

assemblies that their debates should not be awed by fear or disturbed by tumults—it was first by the King's order proclaimed, "That no man, upon pain of forfeiting all his substance, should presume to use or wear any coat of metal, or other weapon, offensive or defensive, in London, Westminster, or the suburbs of the same. And also that during the time of this session no games or other plays of men, women, or children, should be used in Westminster, to the disturbance of the Parliament." A Parliament met at York in the following year. On the first day of their sitting commandment was given to the Mayor of York, in presence of the King and all his Parliament, to see the King's peace kept in the said city, and suburbs thereof, and to arrest all that offended against it. Also, proclamation to be made against weapons and plays, by the steward and marschal, before the house where the Parliament sat, and by the mayor and bailiffs in the city.—*Parliamentary History.*

The First Speaker.—On the 4th August, 1377, writs were issued for the calling a Parliament to meet fifteen days after Michaelmas. The Commons chose Sir Peter De La Mare, knight of the shire for Herefordshire, as their Speaker, and the first upon record. Sir Peter on this occasion made a protestation and said, "That what he had to declare was from their whole body; and therefore required that if he should happen to speak anything without their consents, that it ought to be amended before his departure from the said place. He commended the feats of chivalry heretofore practised, for which this nation was so renowned; and said that by the decay of the same, the honour of the realm did and would daily decrease."—*Ibid.*

A Royal Absentee.—In the tenth year of Richard II. (1387) the Commons sent a message to the King, in which they stated that if the King shall wilfully estrange himself from his Parliament, and be absent from them for the space of forty days, it shall be lawful for all and every of them,

without any damage from the King, to go home and return into their own countries. "And now you," continue the remonstrants, "for a longer time have absented yourself, and have refused to come among them."—*Oldfield's History.*

An Earl's Apology.—In a Parliament of Richard II., held at Westminster, 1394, the Earl of Arundel exhibited a complaint against the Duke of Lancaster, consisting of four distinct charges. To the accusation the King himself answered and affirmed that what the Duke of Lancaster had done was all right and good. And his Majesty, with the assent of the Lords, awarded that the said earl should ask the duke's pardon, in full Parliament, and in the very words following, which he spoke accordingly:—"Sir, Sith that it seemeth to the King and other lords, and eke that each here hath been so mickle grieved and displeased by my words; it forethinketh, and I beseech you of your grace and lordship to quit me your man-tallant."—*Parliamentary History.*

Eating Humble Pie.—In 1397 the House of Commons required of the King (Richard II.), amongst other demands, an avoidance of the extravagant expenses of the King's household, and that bishops and ladies, who had no particular business there, should be forbidden to frequent the Court. The King, hearing of this, was highly incensed and charged the Speaker, Sir John Bussy, upon his allegiance to inform him who it was that had brought the matter into Parliament. The Commons, on being told the King's mind in a conference with the Lords, made a most submissive and even abject apology for their presumption; gave up the name of the person who had brought it into their House—one Thomas Haxey, clerk; and furthermore, proceeded to try poor Thomas Haxey, clerk, and condemned him to die the death of a traitor. The King then informed the Commons that he, out of his royal benignity and gracious seigniory, freely excused them. The scape-goat also came

in for a share in the royal clemency, his life being spared on the petition of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other prelates.—*Ibid.*

A Pious Subsidy.—Henry IV. called a Parliament which met October 6th, 1404. "The Chancellor," says Lord Campbell, in his "Lives of the Chancellors," "in a speech from the text, '*Rex vocavit seniores terræ*,' having pressed most urgently for supplies, the Commons came in a body, and, the King being on the throne, proposed that without burthening his people he might supply his occasions by seizing on the revenues of the clergy. Archbishop Arundel replied that the stripping the clergy of their estates would put a stop to their prayers night and day for the welfare of the State. The Speaker of the Commons, standing at the bar, smiled and said openly that he thought the prayers of the Church a very slender supply."

Royal Rewards to the Speaker.—Of the Parliament which assembled at Westminster, March 1st, 1406, Sir John Tibetot was chosen Speaker. Sir John excused himself on account of his youth and other causes; nevertheless, the King confirmed his election. This youthful Speaker appears to have discharged his functions to the satisfaction of the Court at least; for at the close of the Parliament the King, to show his generosity and gratitude to Sir John, granted to him, in fee, all the lands and hereditaments of Richard ap Griffith ap Voethus, in the counties of Carmarthen and Cardigan, and elsewhere in the principality of South Wales, forfeited to the King by his being an adherent to Owen Glendower, rebel and traitor; and also the office of keeper of the forests of Weybridge and Sapley, in the county of Huntingdon, without any fee or out payments; and further, the goods and chattels of Peter Priswick, carpenter, a felon, amounting to £150. He was afterwards made Earl of Worcester.—*Parliamentary History.*

Petition against a Judge.—In 1434 (13 Henry VI.)

a petition was presented to the Commons of England against Sir William Paston, knight, a judge of the Court of Common Pleas, by William Dalling. The fact that the Commons were appealed to on such a matter, at this early era in our records, is worth notice. The petition is thus given in Sir John Fenn's "Paston Letters":—"Please it to the right sage and wise Commons of this present Parliament, that where(*as*) every justice of the King is sworn that he should not take no fees or rewards for to be of counsel with no man, but only with our sovereign lord the King, and thereto they be sworn. Please it to (*the*) Commons of the present Parliament that William Paston, one of the justices of our sovereign lord (*the*) King, taketh divers fees and rewards of divers persons within the shires of Norfolk and Suffolk, and is withhold with every matter in the said counties; that is to say—Of the town of Yarmouth, 1s. yearly; of the Abbot of St. Benet's, 26s. 8d. [several more are here instanced]; and of Katherine Shelton, 10 marks (£6 13s. 4d), against the King, for to be of her counsel for to destroy the right of the King and of his ward—that is for to say, Ralph, son and heir of John Shelton." In a note prefixed to this petition, it is mentioned that Sir William Paston was born in 1378, became a judge of the Common Pleas in 1430, and from the propriety of his conduct was called the "Good Judge."

Henry VIII.'s Method with the Commons.—The Ministers of Henry VIII., says Oldfield, "moved in 1536 that a bill be brought in to dissolve such monasteries as had not above £200 per annum in land. The bill remained so long in the House that the King, who was impatient to have it passed, took upon himself to expedite its progress. He sent for the members to attend him in his gallery, when, having kept them waiting for a considerable time, he told them fiercely that if the bill did not pass it would cost many of them their heads." It is also related that while

the opposition of the Commons to the imposition lasted, Henry sent for a Mr. Edward Montague, who had considerable influence in the House, and said, "Ho, man! will they not suffer my bill to pass?" and, laying his hand on Montague's head, who was then on his knees before him, "Get my bill passed by to-morrow, or else to-morrow this head of yours will be off." The bill was passed, and Mr. Montague's head was permitted to remain in its ordinary position.

Oriental Adulation.—In 1537 an insult was put upon the House of Commons, which shows most strikingly the degraded state to which Parliament was reduced in the reign of Henry VIII. On the recommendation of the Court, Rich, whose bad character was notorious, and who was hardly free from any vice except hypocrisy, was elected Speaker. He repaid this promotion by comparing the King, on the first day of the session, for prudence to Solomon, for strength to Samson, and for beauty to Absalom; and on the last to the sun, that warms, enlightens, and invigorates the universe.—*Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors."*

"Render unto Cæsar," &c.—Speaker Crooke told Queen Elizabeth (when he was presented to her in the House of Lords, on the occasion of his election to the chair) that England had been defended against the Spanish Armada by her mighty arm; to which she answered from the throne, "No; but by the mighty hand of God, Mr. Speaker."—*D'Ewes' Journal.*

Bribing Members.—Against the calling a new Parliament great sums of money were remitted by the Emperor (Charles V.) to Gardiner, to soften the leading nobility, and carry elections for commoners that would comply with the designs of the Court. The Londoners not liking the intended marriage of Mary with the Prince of Spain, the Parliament was summoned to meet at Oxford, April 2nd, 1544. Lord Chancellor Gardiner having granted pensions to many of the leading members of the House of Commons,

thereby softened them.—*Gurdon's "History of Parliament."*

Commencement of the Journals of the Commons.—A Parliament was called to meet at Westminster on the 4th of November, 1547, in the first year of the reign of Edward VI. The "Parliamentary History" says, "We are now come to a period from which the Journals of the House of Commons are extant. The first volume, which begins with the reign, contains little more than a diurnal succinct account of proceedings in reading bills, &c. * * * The Journals of the Lords are more explicit in the reign before us than those of the Commons."

Secession of Members from the Commons.—In the Parliament which assembled 11th November, 1554, the first of Philip and Mary, the legislative enactments of the three previous reigns against Roman Catholicism were repealed. "A circumstance occurred of a very extraordinary nature in this Parliament" (says the "Parliamentary History"), "and the like of which we have not before met with in the course of this history. This was a voluntary secession of some members of the Commons, who actually left the House when they saw the majority inclined to sacrifice everything to the ministry. Lord Coke, who, in order to do honour to their memories, has preserved their names in his 'Institutes,' states that the Court resented this separation of the members, and ordered the Queen's Attorney-General to indict them in the Court of Queen's Bench. Six of them were so timorous as to submit to the mercy of the Court, and paid their fines. All the rest, amongst whom was that famous lawyer Plowden, traversed; but judgment against them was prevented by the Queen's death."

The Commons and the Suppressed Monasteries.—In 1557 it was stated that Queen Mary intended to rebuild the monasteries and restore the lands which had been

alienated. The knowledge of this intention created such warmth of debate in the Commons that several of the members laid their hands on their swords, saying, "They knew how to defend their own properties." This put a stop to the intentions of the Court.—*Oldfield's History.*

The "Meddlesome" Commons.—A Parliament met in April, 1571, when the Lord Keeper Bacon, in answer to the Speaker's customary request for freedom of speech in the Commons, said that Queen Elizabeth, "having experience of late of some disorder and certain offences, which, though they were not punished, yet were they offences still, and so must be accounted, they would, therefore, do well to meddle with no matter of State but such as should be propounded unto them, and to occupy themselves in other matters concerning the commonwealth." A member having rather prematurely suggested the offer of a subsidy, several complaints were made of irregular and oppressive practices, and Mr. Bell said that licences granted by the Crown and other abuses galled the people, intimating also that the subsidy should be accompanied by a redress of grievances. This occasion of introducing the subject, though strictly constitutional, was likely to cause displeasure. The Speaker informed them, a few days after, of a message from the Queen to spend little time in motions, and make no long speeches. And Bell, it appears, having been sent for by the Council, came into the House "with such an amazed countenance, that it daunted all the rest," who for many days durst not enter on any matter of importance. It became the common whisper that no one must speak against licences, lest the Queen and Council should be angry. And at the close of the session the Lord Keeper severely reprimanded those "audacious, arrogant, and presumptuous members" who had called her Majesty's grants and prerogatives in question, meddling with matters neither pertaining to them nor within

the capacity of their understanding.—*Hallam's "Constitutional History."*

Enraging Queen Elizabeth. — Peter Wentworth, a member whose courageous and independent spirit had already drawn upon him repeated manifestations of royal displeasure, presented to the Lord Keeper a petition, praying that the Upper House would join with the Lower in a supplication to the Queen for fixing the succession. Elizabeth, enraged at the bare mention of a subject so offensive to her, instantly committed to the Fleet Prison Wentworth, Sir Thomas Bromley, who had seconded him, and two other members to whom he had imparted the business; and when the House were preparing to petition her for their release, some Privy Councillors dissuaded them from the step, as one which could only prove injurious to these gentlemen, by giving additional offence to her Majesty. Soon after, James Morice, member for Colchester, an eminent lawyer, who was attorney of the Court of Wards and chancellor of the Duchy, made a motion for redress of the abuses in the Bishops' Court, and especially of the enormous ones committed under the High Commission. Several members supported the motion; but the Queen, sending in wrath for the Speaker, required him to deliver up the bill to her; reminded him of her strict injunctions at the opening of the sessions, and testified her extreme indignation and surprise at the boldness of the Commons in intermeddling with subjects which she had expressly forbidden them to discuss. She informed them that it lay in her power to summon Parliaments and to dismiss them, and to sanction or to reject any determination of theirs; that she had at present called them together for the twofold purpose of enacting further laws for the maintenance of religious conformity, and of providing for the national defence against Spain; and that these ought, therefore, to be the sole objects of their deliberations. As for Morice, he was seized by a

sergeant-at-arms in the House itself, suspended from his office, rendered incapable of practising as a lawyer, and committed to prison.—*Aikin's "Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth."*

A "Pope-like" Speech.—Wentworth, the most distinguished assertor of civil liberty in Elizabeth's reign, related in the House a conversation he had held with Archbishop Parker. "I was," he says; "among others, the last Parliament (1574), sent for unto the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the Articles of Religion that then passed this House. He asked us 'Why we did put out of the book the articles for the homilies, consecration of bishops, and such like?' 'Surely, sir,' said I, 'because we were so occupied in other matters that we had no time to examine them how they agreed with the Word of God.' 'What!' said he; 'surely you mistake the matter; you will refer yourselves wholly to us therein?' 'No; by the faith I bear to God,' said I, 'we will pass nothing before we know what it is; for that were but to make you popes. Make you popes who list,' said I; 'for we will make you none.' And sure, Mr. Speaker, the speech seemed to me to be a Pope-like speech; and I fear lest our bishops do attribute this of the Pope's canons unto themselves—*Papa non potest errare.*"—*Hallam's "Constitutional History."*

Elizabeth and the Bishops.—Elizabeth, in her speech to Parliament on closing the session of 1584, when many complaints against the rulers of the Church had rung in her ears, told the bishops that if they did not amend what was wrong, she meant to depose them.—*Ibid.*

A Member of Parliament Pilloried.—In Grafton's Abridgment of the "Chronicles of England," 1571, there is the following account of a member who fell into great disgrace in the Parliament which sat in 1570:—"An undiscrete Burgeoys of the Parliament.—And it fortuned that in the said Parliament one very indiscrete and unmete man

was returned a Burgeoys for the borough of Westbury, in Wiltshire, who being instructed by such as delighted to abuse his simplicitie to evil purposes, as he himselfe in the Parliament Hous (beyng sober) openly declared, or els caryed by excesse of drink, or both, did spreade abroade lewde and sedicious rumours against the Queenes Majesties person. And being thereof detected to the Parliament House, and the offence by hym confessed, and his defectes and insufficiency well considered, hee was from the House committed to ward. And for that there was confessed corruption in receaving of money for his election, and also a band taken of him by certein of the town of Westbury, to save them harmless of the said corrupt retorne (as hee confessed), the Towne was amerced by the Parliament House at twentie pounds. And it was ordered that hee should have his said bande redelyvered. And afterward the sayd person, for the spreading of his sedicious rumour, he was, by order of the Quenes Majesties most honorable Council, sett on the pillory in Chepesyde in London."—*Notes and Queries.*

"Hemming" a Member Down.—Serjeant Heale, addressing the House in 1601, said, "The Queen hath as much right to all our lands and goods as to the revenue of her Crown;" at which all the House hemmed, and laughed, and talked. "Well," quoth Serjeant Heale, "all your hemming shall not put me out of countenance." So Mr. Speaker stood up and said, "It is a great disorder that this should be used, for it is the ancient use of every man to be silent when any one speaketh; and he that is speaking should be suffered to deliver his mind without interruption." So the Serjeant proceeded, and when he had spoken a little while, the House hemmed again, and so he sat down.—*Parliamentary History.*

Parliamentary Despatch.—Mr. Popham, when he was Speaker, and the Lower House had sat long and done in effect nothing, coming one day to Queen Elizabeth, she

said to him, "Now, Mr. Speaker, what has passed in the Lower House?" He answered, "If it please your Majesty, seven weeks."—*Lord Bacon's "Apothegms."*

Insulting the Commons.—In the report of a committee, 20th June, 1604, the following subject of complaint to the King was made among others: "The Gentleman Usher's fault in depriving, by his unaccustomed neglect, a great part of our House from hearing your Majesty's Speech the first day of Parliament. * * * The Yeoman of the Guard's words were very opprobrious; and howsoever they might have been not unfitly applied to the peasants of France, or boores of Germany, yet could they not be other than very reproachful and injurious to the great dignities and honour of the Commons of the realm." The following minute of the circumstance occurs in the Journals of the House:—"Brian Tash, the Yeoman of the Guard keeping one of the doors of the Upper House, repulsed several members of the Lower House, and shut the door upon them, with these uncivil and contemptible terms, 'Goodmen burgesses, you come not here.'"—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

The Gunpowder Plot.—In the Journals of the Commons, November 5th, 1605, occurs this entry:—"This last night the Upper House of Parliament was searched by Sir Thomas Knevett, and one Johnston, servant to Mr. Thomas Percyl, was there apprehended, who had placed thirty-six barrels of gunpowder in the vault under the House, with a purpose to blow up the King and the whole company when they should there assemble. Afterwards divers other gentlemen were discovered to be of the plot." The King, addressing the Parliament on that occasion, said: "This may well be called a roaring, nay, a thundering sin of fire and brimstone, from the which God hath so miraculously delivered us all."—*Parliamentary History.*

Disputing Royal Interference.—A double return having been made in an election for the county of Bucks

in the third year of the reign of King James I. (1606), the House decided that Sir Francis Goodwin was duly elected, and nullified the return of Sir John Fortescue. The King interposing desired the Lords to demand a conference with the Commons on the subject. This the Commons refused; and also declined to comply with a positive command that they should confer with one of the judges. The matter was adjusted by Sir Francis yielding up his right.—*Oldfield's History.*

An Episcopal Disclaimer.—In 1614 Dr. Richard Neile, Bishop of Lincoln, uttered some words which gave offence to the Commons, and they complained of them in a message to the Lords, to which they received an answer that the bishop "had made solemn protestation, upon his salvation, that he had not spoke anything with any evil intention to that House, which he doth with all his heart duly respect and highly esteem; expressing, with many tears, his sorrow that his words were so misconceived, and strained further than he ever meant; which submissive and ingenuous behaving of himself had satisfied the Lords, and their lordships assure the Commons that if they had conceived the lord bishop's words to have been spoken, or meant, to cast any aspersion of sedition or undutifulness upon that House, their lordships would forthwith have proceeded to the censuring and punishing thereof with all severity."—*Sir T. Erskine May's "Law, &c., of Parliament."*

The "Kings" of the Lower House.—James, notwithstanding his arbitrary notions of the kingly power and "right divine," appears to have been duly impressed with the power of the House of Commons. Mr. Forster, in his "Arrest," relates that Sir Robert Cotton was one of the twelve members who carried their famous declaration (against monopolies, in 1620) to King James at Newmarket, when the quick-witted, shrewd old monarch called out, "Chairs! chairs! here be twal kynges comin!" The

following instance of the King's impression is given by L'Estrange:—The King mounted his horse one time, who formerly used to be very sober and quiet, but then began to bound and prance. "The de'il i' my saul, sirrah," says he, "an you be not quiet I'se send you to the five hundred kings in the House of Commons; they'll quickly tame you."

Freedom of Debate.—In the session of the eighteenth of King James I. (1621), Sir Edwin Sandys, having spoken with great earnestness and freedom on various matters of moment, incurred the displeasure of the King and his ministers. The House, by its vote, cleared him from having given any just cause of offence; but as soon as the adjournment took place, he was committed by a warrant of the Privy Council, for a misdemeanour. After a confinement of nearly six months, he was liberated by a warrant from the King, a few days before the Parliament again met. This affair gave rise to violent debates inside the House, and caused much commotion without.—*Oldfield's History.*

Opening of Parliament by James I. in 1621.—In the King's short progress from Whitehall to Westminster, these passages following were accounted somewhat remarkable. First, that he spake often and lovingly to the people, standing thick and threefold on all sides to behold him, "God bless ye! God bless ye!" contrary to his former hasty and passionate custom, which often, in his sudden distemper, would bid a p—— or a plague on such as flocked to see him. Secondly, that though the windows were filled with many great ladies as he rode along, yet that he spake to none of them but to the Marquis of Buckingham's mother and wife, who was the sole daughter and heiress of the Earl of Rutland. Thirdly, that he spake particularly and bowed to the Count of Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador. And, fourthly, that looking up to one window as he passed, full of gentlewomen or ladies, all in yellow bands, he cried out aloud, "A p—— take ye! are ye there?" at which, being

much ashamed, they all withdrew themselves suddenly from the window.—*D'Ewes' Autobiography.*

The King Erasing a Declaration of Privilege.—In the session of 1621 the Commons began to show evident signs of that discontent which afterwards broke out into such serious controversies with the Crown. Sir Richard Grosvenor said, "We have hitherto sung nothing but *placebo*, and danced to the King's heart; but it hath now pleased his Majesty to change this tune, and to make us sing nothing but *lachrymæ*, and sing *loath to depart.*" * * * At length the misunderstanding between James and the Commons attained such a height that the King, with his own hand, erased from the Journals of the Commons the celebrated protestation or declaration of their liberties and privileges, which they had passed in anticipation of a dissolution; and, on the 6th January, 1621, published a proclamation declaring the Parliament dissolved, and animadverting with severity on those ill-tempered spirits who had compelled him thus to exercise his prerogative. But James was not contented with the bare expression of his displeasure; several leading members of the country party, amongst whom was Sir Edward Coke, were committed to the Tower.—*Roscoe's "Eminent British Lawyers."*

A Prophecy. — Upon the occasion of impeaching Bristol and the Earl of Middlesex, James I., says Clarendon, told his son that "he would live to have his bellyful of Parliament impeachments."

Boys in the House of Commons.—Sir Robert Naunton, in his "Fragmenta Regalia," writing of Queen Elizabeth's reign, says: "I find not that the House was at any time weakened and pestered with the admission of too many young heads, as it hath been of later times; which remembers me of Recorder Martin's speech, about the tenth of our late sovereign lord, King James, when there were accounts taken of forty gentlemen not above twenty, and some not

exceeding sixteen; which moved him to say, 'That it was the ancient custome for old men to make lawes for young ones, but that then he saw the case altered, and that there were children elected into the great Councell of the kingdome, which came to invade and invert nature, and to enact lawes to govern their fathers.'" Hatsell, in his "Precedents," remarks that the poet Waller, among others, sat in Parliament (1622) before he was seventeen years of age. Notwithstanding the opinion of Sir Edward Coke as to the *law*, it is certain that the practice was different. The question was, however, finally settled by the 7th and 8th of William III., c. 25, which makes void the election of any person who is not twenty-one years of age.

First Meeting of Charles I. and the Parliament.—It cannot be alleged against Charles I. that he preceded the Parliament in the war of words. He courted their affections; and even in his manner of reception, amidst the dignity of the regal office, studiously showed his exterior respect by the marked solemnity of their first meeting. As yet uncrowned, on the day on which he first addressed the Lords and Commons he wore his crown, and vailed it at the opening and on the close of his speech—a circumstance to which the Parliament had not been accustomed. Another ceremony gave still greater solemnity to the meeting; the King would not enter into business till they had united in prayer. He commanded the doors to be closed, and a bishop to perform the office. The suddenness of this unexpected command disconcerted the Catholic lords, of whom the less rigid knelt, and the moderate stood: there was one startled Papist who did nothing but cross himself.—*Isaac D'Israeli* (*from MS. letters of the times*).

A Slight from the Black Rod.—On the 19th of March, 1627, the Commons were sent for to attend the King in the House of Lords, by a Mr. Crane. It was very ill taken that Mr. Maxwell, Knight of the Black Rod, had

not come himself to bring the message, as had formerly been used; insomuch that sundry members of the House advised that Mr. Speaker elect should not stir till they had received the message by Mr. Maxwell himself. But others (howsoever they acknowledged this to have been a great neglect in Mr. Maxwell, and wrong to the House) advised, because his Majesty stayed for them, that they should not now further insist upon it, but go up; and so they did.—*Quoted in Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

A Dream Related in Parliament.—A startling message, on the 12th of April, 1627, was sent by the King for the despatch of business. The House, struck with astonishment, desired to have it repeated. They remained sad and silent; no one cared to open the debate. A whimsical, crack-brained politician, Sir James Nethersole, suddenly started up, entreating leave to tell his last night's dream. Some laughing at him, he observed that "kingdoms had been saved by dreams!" Allowed to proceed he said, "he saw two good pastures; a flock of sheep was in the one, and a bellwether alone in the other; a great ditch was between them, and a narrow bridge over the ditch." He was interrupted by the Speaker, who told him that it stood not with the gravity of the House to listen to dreams; but the House was inclined to hear him out. "The sheep would sometimes go over to the bellwether, or the bellwether to the sheep. Once both met on the narrow bridge, and the question was who should go back, since both could not go on without danger. One sheep gave counsel that the sheep on the bridge should lie on their bellies, and let the bellwether go over their backs." The application of this dilemma he left to the House. * * Elliot, Wentworth, and Coke protested against the interpretation of dreams in the House.—*Isaac D'Israeli (from a manuscript letter).*

A "Spectacle of Woe."—On the 7th of June, 1627, a sudden message from the King absolutely forbade the Com-

mons to asperse any of his Majesty's ministers, otherwise his Majesty would instantly dissolve them. This fell like a thunderbolt; it struck terror and alarm, and at the instant the House was changed into a scene of tragical melancholy. All the opposite passions of human nature—all the national evils which were one day to burst on the country, seemed, on a sudden, concentrated in this single spot. Some were seen weeping, some were expostulating, and some, in awful prophecy, were contemplating the future ruin of the kingdom; while others, of more ardent daring, were reproaching the timid, quieting the terrified, and infusing resolution into the despairing. Many attempted to speak, but were so strongly affected that their very utterance failed them. The venerable Coke, overcome by his feelings when he rose to speak, found his learned eloquence falter on his tongue; he sat down, and tears were seen on his aged cheeks. The name of the public enemy of the kingdom (the Duke of Buckingham) was repeated, till the Speaker, with tears covering his face, declared he could no longer witness such a spectacle of woe in the Commons of England, and requested leave of absence for half an hour. The Speaker hastened to the King, to inform him of the state of the House. They were preparing a vote against the duke, for being an arch-traitor and arch-enemy to King and kingdom, and were busied on their "Remonstrance," when the Speaker, on his return, delivered his Majesty's message, that they should adjourn till the next day. This was an awful interval of time; many trembled for the issue of the next morning: one letter-writer calls it "that black and doleful Thursday!" and another, writing before the House met, observes, "What we shall expect this morning, God of heaven knows; we shall meet timely."—*D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature."*

Coercion of Mr. Speaker.—In 1628, during the Parliament rendered famous by the Petition of Rights,

Denzil Hollis was one of the most ardent opponents of the Court, the Duke of Buckingham, and all the oppressive measures under which the country groaned. On the 2nd of March, 1629, the Speaker of the Commons, in obedience to the orders of the King, was about to declare the adjournment of the House and to leave his chair, when Mr. Hollis made him resume his seat, and kept him there by force, saying, "God's wounds, Mr. Speaker, you shall sit still till it please the House to rise!"—*Guizot's "Biographic Studies of the English Revolution."*

Refusing to Put the Question. — Sir Simonds D'Ewes, in his "Autobiography," relates that the House met on the 3rd of March, 1629, and on "Sir John Finch, their Speaker, being the Queen's solicitor, refusing to do his office or to read some particular writings the House enjoined him, many members thereof fell to reproving him, others to excuse him; and the tumult and discontent of the whole House was so great, as the more grave and judicious thereof began infinitely to fear lest at the last swords should have been drawn, and that forenoon ended in blood." Selden thus addressed the Speaker on this occasion:— "Dare not you, Mr. Speaker, put the question when we command you? If you will not put it, we must sit still; thus we shall never be able to do anything: they that come after you may say they have the King's command not to do it. We sit here by command of the King under the Great Seal, and you are by his Majesty sitting in his royal chair, before both Houses appointed our Speaker, and now you refuse to perform your office."

Compulsory Detention of Members.—A motion of Pym's, on the subject of grievances, was under discussion in the Commons, November 6th, 1640, when, the time of rising being come, and other members appearing ready to continue the debate, an order was suddenly made that the door be shut and none suffered to go out. The Lords were

also advertised, that that House, too, might be kept from rising.—*Parry's "Parliaments of England."*

The Commons Ordering a Speech to be Burnt.—Lord Digby having printed his speech on Lord Strafford's Bill of Attainder, a committee of the Commons appointed to inquire into the matter made their report on the 13th June, 1641. The House thereupon resolved: "That no member of this House shall give a copy, or publish in print anything that he shall speak here, without leave of the House; and declare that Lord Digby's speech was untrue, and scandalous to the proceedings of this House; and order it to be burnt."—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

A Convenient Elevation.—My Lord Digby having spoken something in the House of Commons for which they would have questioned him, was presently called to the Upper House. He did by the Parliament as an ape when he hath done some waggery: his master spies him, and he looks for his whip; but before he can come at him, whip, says he, to the top of the house.—*Selden's "Table Talk."*

A Member Exalting Himself.—The Great Remonstrance lay engrossed on the table of the House on Monday, the 22nd of November, 1641, waiting the final vote. Mr. John Digby, member for Milborn Port, came into the House, and getting upon the ladder that stands at the door of the House, by which the members thereof usually go up to those seats which are over the same door under the gallery, he sat still upon the same ladder. Whereupon Mr. Speaker Lenthal called out to him, and desired him to take his place, and not to sit upon the said ladder, as if he were going to be hanged; "at which," says the narrator, "many of the House laughed."— *Forster's "Grand Remonstrance."*

The Grand Remonstrance.—Hardly had announcement been made of the division which carried the Grand Remonstrance by a majority of eleven votes (November 22nd, 1641), when one more strenuous effort was made to have it

addressed to the King. Several members opposed the printing of the declaration, and desired to enter their protest. About one of the clock of the morning ensuing, Mr. George Palmer, a lawyer of the Middle Temple, stood up. He should not be satisfied, he said, for himself or those around him, unless a day were at once appointed for discussion of whether the right to protest did not exist in that House; and, meanwhile, he would move that the Clerk should now enter the names of all those whose claim to protest would then have to be determined. At these words the excitement broke out afresh; loud cries of "All! All!" burst from every side where any of Hyde's party sat; and Palmer, carried beyond his first intention by the passion of the moment, cried out, unexpectedly, that he *did* for himself then and there protest, for himself and all the rest—"of his mind," he afterwards declared that he meant to have added, but for the storm which suddenly arose. The word *All!* had fallen like a lighted match upon gunpowder. It was taken up and passed from mouth to mouth with an exasperation bordering on frenzy; and to those who in after years recalled the scene, under that sudden glare of excitement, after a sitting of fifteen hours—the worn-out, weary assemblage; the ill-lighted, dreary chamber; the hour sounding one after midnight; confused, loud cries breaking forth unexpectedly, and startling gestures of violence accompanying them—it presented itself to the memory as a very Valley of the Shadow of Death. "All! all!" says D'Ewes, was cried from side to side; and some waved their hats over their heads, and others took their swords in their scabbards out of their belts, and held them by the pommels in their hands, setting the lower part on the ground; so, if God had not prevented it, there was very great danger that mischief might have been done. All those who cried "All! all!" and did the other particulars, were of the number of those that were against the Remonstrance. And amongst them was

the promising young gentleman of the King's house, Mr. Philip Warwick, the member for Radnor, who bethought himself of that brief Scriptural comparison from the wars of Saul and David (2 Samuel ii. 12—16), his application of which comprised all that, until now, was known to us of this extraordinary scene. He thought of what Abner said to Joab, and Joab to Abner, when they met on either side of the Pool of Gibeon; and how, having arisen at the bidding of their leaders, to make trial of prowess, their young men caught every one his fellow by the head, and thrust his sword in his fellow's side, and so fell down together; a result which might have followed, had not the sagacity and great calmness of Mr. Hampden, by a short speech, prevented it.—*Ibid.*

"Pull the Rogues out by the Ears!"—Mr. Forster, in his "Arrest of the Five Members," relates the following scene in the Queen's apartments, on the morning of the 4th January, 1642, as given in Coke's Manuscript, preserved by Archetel Grey:—"A long and very passionate debate had passed in the royal chamber on the night of the fruitless attempt of the Attorney-General, the Queen taking prominent part therein; and it had ended, according to this account, in the settled resolve that Charles would himself demand the members next morning. But his heart failed him when the morning came. He went to the Queen's apartments early, and finding Lady Carlisle with her, took her Majesty into her closet, and there having put to her all the hazards of the attempt, and all its possible consequences, declared that he must abandon it. Whereat the Queen, no longer able to contain her passion, violently burst out, "*Allez, poltron!* Go, pull these rogues out by the ears, *ou ne me revoyez jamais!*" Without replying, the King left the room. The anecdote, says Mr. Forster, is certainly not in any respect reliable, if accepted strictly in this form; but it seems to favour the supposition of some admixture of truth in it.

A Gallant Contribution.—Mr. Henry Killegrew, of Cornwall, member for West Looe, a staunch Royalist, on being invited, with the other members, to offer a contribution towards the formation of an army for the Parliament, stood up and answered he would provide a good horse, and a good sword, and a good buff coat, and then he would find a good cause. "Which for that time," says Clarendon, "only raised laughter, though they knew well what cause he thought good, which he had never dissembled."

Imprudence.—Selden says: "The King calling his friends from the Parliament, because he had use of them at Oxford, is as if a man should have use of a little piece of wood, and he runs down into the cellar and takes the spigott: in the meantime all the beer runs about the house. When his friends are absent the King will be lost."—*Table Talk.*

Peers Sitting in the House of Commons.—By the Act passed in March, 1648, for abolishing the House of Peers, it was declared, "That such Lords as have demeaned themselves with honour, courage, and fidelity to the Commonwealth, and their posterity who shall continue so, shall not be excluded from the public councils of the nation, but shall be admitted thereunto, and have their free vote in Parliament, if they shall be thereunto elected, as other persons of interest, elected and qualified thereunto, ought to have." In consequence hereof the Earl of Pembroke took his seat in the House of Commons on the 16th of April, 1649, as knight of the shire for Berks; as did also, in the same year, W. Earl of Salisbury, as a burgess for Lynne, and Edward Lord Howard, of Escrike, as a citizen for Carlisle. These were the only Peers that were elected members of the House of Commons.—*Parliamentary History.*

Altering the Lord's Prayer.—There was a most bloody-minded "maker of washing-balls," as one John Durant is described, appointed a lecturer by the House of

Commons ("The Rump"), who always left out of the Lord's Prayer, "As we forgive them that trespass against us," and substituted, "Lord, since thou hast now drawn out thy sword, let it not be sheathed again till it be glutted in the blood of the malignants."—*D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature."*

The First Reform in Parliament.—A House of Commons was a necessary part of Cromwell's new polity. In constituting this body, the Protector showed a wisdom and a public spirit which were not duly appreciated by his contemporaries. The vices of the old representative system, though by no means so serious as they afterwards became, had already been remarked by far-sighted men. Cromwell reformed that system on the same principles on which Mr. Pitt, a hundred and thirty years later, attempted to reform it, and on which it was at length reformed in our own times. * * To create a House of Lords was a less easy task. It was to no purpose that he offered to the chiefs of illustrious families seats in his new senate. They conceived that they could not accept a nomination to an upstart assembly without renouncing their birthright and betraying their order. The Protector was, therefore, under the necessity of filling his Upper House with new men who, during the late stirring times, had made themselves conspicuous. This was the least happy of his contrivances, and displeased all parties. The Levellers were angry with him for instituting a privileged class. The multitude, which felt respect and fondness for the great historical names of the land, laughed without restraint at a House of Lords in which lucky draymen and shoemakers were seated, to which few of the old nobles were invited, and from which almost all those old nobles who were invited turned disdainfully away. * * The first House of Commons which the people elected by his command questioned his authority, and was dissolved without having passed a single Act. His second House of Commons, though it recognised him as

Protector, and would gladly have made him King, obstinately refused to acknowledge his new Lords. He had no course left but to dissolve the Parliament. "God," he exclaimed, at parting, "be judge between you and me!" —*Macaulay's "History of England."*

Power of Parliament to Convene itself.—By a statute, 16 Car. I. c. 1, it was enacted that, if the King neglected to call a Parliament for three years, the Peers might assemble and issue out writs for choosing one; and, in case of neglect of the Peers, the constituents might meet and elect one themselves. But this, if ever put in practice, would have been liable to several inconveniences; and the Act itself was esteemed so highly detrimental and injurious to the royal prerogative that it was repealed by statute 16 Car. II. c. 1. * * The Convention Parliament, which restored King Charles II., met above a month before his return: the Lords by their own authority, and the Commons in pursuance of writs issued in the names of the keepers of the liberty of England by authority of Parliament. The said Parliament sat till the 29th of December, full seven months after the Restoration, and enacted many laws, several of which are still in force. But this was for the necessity of the King, which supersedes all law; for if they had not so met, it was morally impossible that the kingdom should have been settled in peace. And the first thing done after the King's return was to pass an Act declaring this to be a good Parliament, notwithstanding the defect of the King's writs. * * It was at that time a great doubt among the lawyers whether even this healing Act made it a good Parliament, and held by very many in the negative, though it seems to have been too nice a scruple. And yet, out of abundant caution, it was thought necessary to confirm its Acts in the next Parliament, by statute 13 Car. II. c. 7 and c. 14.—*Blackstone's Commentaries.*

"Dissolution" or "Interruption."—*Jan. 9th*, 1659—60. W. Simons told me how his uncle Scobell (Clerk to the House of Commons) was on Saturday last called to the bar, for entering in the Journal of the House, for the year 1653, these words: "This day his Excellence the Lord G. Cromwell dissolved this House," which words the Parliament voted a forgery, and demanded of him how they came to be entered. He said that they were his own handwriting, and that he did it by rights of his office, and the practice of his predecessor; and that the intent of the practice was to let posterity know how such and such a Parliament was dissolved, whether by command of the King or by their own neglect, as the last House of Lords was; and that to this end he had said and writ that it was dissolved by his Excellence the Lord G.; and that for the word dissolved, he never at the time did hear of any other term; and desired pardon if he would not dare to make a word himself what it was six years after, before they came themselves to call it an interruption; that they were so little satisfied with this answer, that they did chuse a committee to report to the House whether this crime of Mr. Scobell's did come within the Act of Indemnity or no.—*Pepys' Diary.*

Scandalous Scenes.—*December 19th*, 1666. I up to the Lords' House to enquire for my Lord Bellasses; and there hear how, at a conference this morning between the two Houses about the business of the Canary Company, my Lord Buckingham leaning rudely over my Lord Marquis Dorchester, my Lord Dorchester removed his elbow. Duke of Buckingham asked whether he was uneasy; Dorchester replied, yes, and that he durst not do this anywhere else; Buckingham replied, yes he would, and that he was a better man than himself; Dorchester said that he lyed. With this, Buckingham struck off his hat, and took him by his periwigg and pulled it aside, and held him. My Lord Chamberlain and others interposed, and upon coming into the House the

Lords did order them both to the Tower, whither they are to go this afternoon. This day's work will bring the Lieutenant of the Tower £350. * * * Sir R. Ford did make me understand how the House of Commons is a beast not to be understood, it being impossible to know beforehand the success almost of any small plain thing, there being so many to think and speak to any business, and they of so uncertain minds, and interests, and passions. He did tell me, and so did Sir W. Batten, how Sir Allen Brodericke and Sir Allen Apsly did come drunk the other day into the House, and did both speak for half an hour, together, and could not be either laughed, or pulled, or bid to sit down and hold their peace, to the great contempt of the King's servants and cause; which I am grieved at with all my heart.—*Pepys' Diary.*

A Whip by the Court.—*December 8th*, 1666. The great Proviso passed the House of Parliament yesterday, which makes the King and Court mad, the King having given order to my Lord Chamberlain to send to the play-houses and brothels, to bid all the Parliament-men that were there to go to the Parliament presently. This is true, it seems; but it was carried against the Court by thirty or forty voices. It is a Proviso to the Poll Bill, that there shall be a committee of nine persons that shall have the inspection upon oath, and power of giving others, of all the accounts of the money given and spent for this warr. This hath a most sad face, and will breed very ill blood.—*Ibid.*

Parliament "Fooled" by Charles II.—Pepys in his Diary gives the following account of the cavalier treatment of a Parliament by this sovereign:—"*July 25th*, 1667. I demanded of Sir R. Ford and the rest, what passed to-day at the meeting of Parliament: who told me that, contrary to all expectation by the King that there would be but a thin meeting, there met above 300 this first day, and all the discontented party; and, indeed, the whole House seems to be

no other almost. The Speaker told them, as soon as they were sat, that he was ordered by the King to let them know he was hindered by some important business to come to them and speak to them, as he intended; and therefore ordered him to move that they would adjourn themselves till Monday next (it being very plain to all the House that he expects to hear by that time of the sealing of the Peace, which by letters, it seems, from my Lord Hollis was to be sealed the last Sunday). But before they would come to the question whether they would adjourn, Sir Thomas Tomkins steps up and tells them that all the country is grieved at this new-raised standing army; and that they thought themselves safe enough in their trayn-bands; and that, therefore, he desired the King might be moved to disband them." A vote to this effect being passed, the House adjourned. Four days afterwards Pepys writes: — "Presently comes down the House of Commons (in Westminster Hall), the King having made a very short and no pleasing speech to them at all, not at all giving them thanks for their readiness to come up to town at this busy time; but told them that he did think he should have had occasion for them, but had none, and therefore did dismiss them to look after their own occasions till October; and that he did wonder any should offer to bring in a suspicion that he intended to rule by an army, or otherwise than by the laws of the land, which he promised them he would do; and so bade them go home and settle the minds of the country in that particular; and only added, that he had made a peace which he did believe they would find reasonable, and a good peace, but did give them none of the particulars thereof. Thus they are dismissed again, to their general great distaste (I believe the greatest that ever Parliament was) to see themselves so fooled, and the nation in certain condition of ruin, while the King, they see, is only governed by his lust, and women and rogues about him.

The Speaker, they found, was kept from coming in the morning to the House on purpose, till after the King was come to the House of Lords, for fear they should be doing anything in the House of Commons to the further dissatisfaction of the King and his courtiers."

Intolerance in the House of Commons.—*February 10th*, 1667—68. To Westminster Hall, where the hall mighty full: and, among other things, the House begins to sit to-day, and the King came. But before the King's coming the House of Commons met; and, upon information given them of a bill intended to be brought in, as common report said, for Comprehension, they did mightily and generally inveigh against it; and did vote that the King should be desired by the House (and the message delivered by the Privy Counsellors of the House) that the laws against breakers of the Act for Uniformity should be put in execution: and it was moved in the House that if any people had a mind to bring any new laws into the House about religion, they might come as a proposer of new laws did in Athens, with ropes about their necks.—*Ibid.*

Number and Payment of Members.—*March 30th*, 1668. At dinner we had a great deal of good discourse about Parliament; their number being uncertain, and always at the will of the King to increase as he saw reason to erect a new borough. But all concluded that the bane of the Parliament hath been the leaving off the old custom of the places allowing wages to those that served them in Parliament, by which they chose men that understood their business and would attend it, and they could expect an account from; which now they cannot: and so the Parliament is become a company of men unable to give account for the interest of the place they serve for.—*Ibid.*

"Our Masters at Westminster."—*April 22nd*, 1668. "From the Privy stairs," writes Pepys, "to Westminster Hall: and taking water. The King and the Duke of York

were in the new buildings; and the Duke of York called to me whither I was going. And I answered aloud, 'To wait on our masters at Westminster;' at which he and all the company laughed; but I was sorry and troubled for it afterwards, for fear any Parliament-man should have been there; and it will be a caution to me for the time to come."

Holding the Purse-strings.—*April 30th*, 1668. The Parliament several months upon an Act for £300,000, but cannot or will not agree upon it, but do keep it back, in spite of the King's desires to hasten it, till they can obtain what they have a mind in revenge upon some men for the late ill managements; and he is forced to submit to what they please, knowing that without it he shall have no money; and they as well that if they give the money the King will suffer them to do little more.—*Ibid.*

Origin of the "Cabinet."—Few things in our history are more curious than the origin and growth of the power now possessed by the Cabinet. From an early period the Kings of England had been assisted by a Privy Council, to which the law assigned many important functions and duties. During several centuries this body deliberated on the gravest and most delicate affairs. But by degrees its character changed: it became too large for despatch and secresy; the rank of privy councillor was often bestowed as an honorary distinction on persons to whom nothing was confided, and whose opinion was never asked; the sovereign, on the most important occasions, resorted for advice to a small knot of leading ministers. The advantages and disadvantages of this course were early pointed out by Bacon, with his usual judgment and sagacity; but it was not till after the Restoration that the interior council began to attract general notice. During many years old-fashioned politicians continued to regard the Cabinet as an unconstitutional and dangerous board; nevertheless, it constantly became more and more important. It at length drew to

tself the chief executive power, and has now been regarded, during several generations, as an essential part of our polity. Yet, strange to say, it still continues to be altogether unknown to the law; the names of the noblemen and gentlemen who compose it are never officially announced to the public; no record is kept of its meetings and resolutions, nor has its existence ever been recognised by any Act of Parliament.—*Macaulay's "History of England."*

The "Cabal."—During some years the word Cabal was popularly used as synonymous with Cabinet. But it happened by a whimsical coincidence that, in 1671, the Cabinet consisted of five persons the initial letters of whose names made up the word cabal—Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. These ministers were, therefore, emphatically called the "cabal;" and they soon made that appellation so infamous that it has never since their time been used except as a term of reproach.—*Ibid.*

Debate without Reason.—Lord Keeper Guilford once dining with Mr. Hugh May, in Scotland Yard, Sir Henry Capel, who was of his lordship's relation and long acquaintance, made one. Among other discourse, Sir Henry Capel was urged much to say why they (meaning the country party) urged a certain matter so violently in the House of Commons, and yet there was no tolerable reason in all the debate given for it. At last he answered that "they did not use to give the true reasons that swayed them in debates to the House." His lordship thought it a strange account. —*North's "Life of Guilford."*

A Disputed Division.—May 10th, 1675, a debate took place in the Commons respecting the English regiments in the French army, the King (Charles II.) having stated that it would be inconsistent with his honour to recall them. On a division, the tellers were charged with negligence or fraud; instantly the leaders, who sat on the lower benches, sprung to the table, and the other members

on each side crowded to their support. Lord Cavendish and Sir John Hanmer distinguished themselves by their violence; and epithets of insult, with threats of defiance, were reproachfully exchanged. The tumult had lasted half an hour, when the Speaker, without asking permission, took possession of the chair; the mace, after some resistance, was again placed upon the table; the members resumed their seats, and, on the motion of Sir Thomas Lee, a promise was given by each in his turn that he would take no notice out of doors of what had happened within.—*Lingard's "History of England."*

Counting Ten for One.—The former Parliament had passed a very strict Act for the due execution of the *Habeas Corpus*, which was, indeed, all they did. It was carried by an odd artifice in the House of Lords. Lord Grey and Lord Norris were named to be the tellers. Lord Norris being a man subject to vapours, was not at all times attentive to what he was doing; so a very fat lord coming in, Lord Grey counted him for ten, as a jest at first, but seeing Lord Norris had not observed it he went on with his misreckoning of ten. So it was reported to the House and declared that they who were for the bill were the majority, though it, indeed, went on the other side. And by this means the bill passed.—*Burnet's History of his own Time* (1680).

The Case Altered.—A division took place in the Commons, session 1685, on a motion to consider the King's Speech before they should proceed to the supply, when it was carried by one only against the Court. The Earl of Middleton, of Scotland, then a Secretary of State for England, and a member of the House of Commons, here seeing many go out upon the division against the Court who were in the service of the Government, went down to the bar, and, as they were told in, reproached them to their faces for voting as they did; and a Captain Kendal being one of them, the earl said to him there, "Sir, have not you a

troop of horse in his Majesty's service?" "Yes, my lord," replies the other; "but my brother died last night, and has left me £700 a year." This I had from my uncle, the first Lord Onslow, who was then of the House of Commons and present. This incident upon one vote probably saved the nation.—*Note by Onslow in Burnet's History.*

Setting his House in Order.—A question was raised in the House of Lords, 1677, as to the legality of a prorogation. Buckingham, Shaftesbury, Salisbury, and Wharton, for the part they took in the debate, were offered the alternative of asking pardon as delinquents, or being sent to the Tower; they chose the latter. The Duke of Buckingham left the House while Lord Anglesea was arguing against their imprisonment, but he came into his place next day, and excused his departure by saying that, as he saw their lordships intended he should lodge some time in another place, and as he kept his family with very exact economy, he had been home to set his house in order, and was now ready to submit to their pleasure.—*Burnet's History.*

Judge Jefferies not "Parliament Proof."—After the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, in 1679, the country party petitioned for the calling of a Parliament in terms offensive to the Court; and in opposition to these petitions the prerogative party addressed the Crown, expressing their abhorrence of the tumultuous proceedings of the petitioners. In encouraging these *abhorrers*, as they were termed, Jefferies rendered himself eminently conspicuous, and, on the meeting of the new Parliament in 1680, he fell, with the rest of those who had opposed the petition for its assembling, under the censure of the Commons. Accordingly, on the 13th of November, 1680, it was resolved, "That Sir George Jefferies, Recorder of the City of London, by traducing and obstructing petitioning for the sitting of this Parliament, hath destroyed the right of the subject;" and it was ordered that an humble address should be

presented to his Majesty (Charles II.) to remove Sir George Jefferies from all public offices. To this address his Majesty replied that he would consider of it. Jefferies himself trembled at the prospect of popular indignation. Being brought to the bar of the House, he received a reprimand on his knees, and such was the effect of this discipline upon his spirits, that he immediately resolved to resign his office of Recorder, which drew from the King the observation that he was not "Parliament proof."—*Roscoe's "Eminent British Lawyers."*

Origin of the Terms "Whig" and "Tory."—At this time (1679) were first heard the two nicknames which, though originally given in insult, were soon assumed with pride, which are still in daily use, which have spread as widely as the English race, and which will last as long as the English literature. It is a curious circumstance that one of these nicknames was of Scotch and the other of Irish origin. Both in Scotland and in Ireland misgovernment had called into existence bands of desperate men, whose ferocity was heightened by religious enthusiasm. In Scotland, some of the persecuted Covenanters, driven mad by oppression, had lately murdered the Primate, had taken arms against the Government, had obtained some advantages against the King's forces, and had not been put down till Monmouth, at the head of some troops from England, had routed them at Bothwell Bridge. These zealots were most numerous among the rustics of the western lowlands, who were vulgarly called Whigs. Thus the appellation of Whig was fastened on the Presbyterian zealots of Scotland, and was transferred to those English politicians who showed a disposition to oppose the Court, and to treat Protestant Nonconformists with indulgence. The bogs of Ireland at the same time afforded a refuge to Popish outlaws, much resembling those who were afterwards known as Whiteboys. These men were then called Tories. The name of Tory was therefore given to

Englishmen who refused to concur in excluding a Roman Catholic prince from the throne.—*Macaulay's "History of England."* Professor Pryme says, in his "Recollections," "O'Connell showed me in the library of the House of Commons, as an illustration of the name of Tory, an Irish Act of Parliament for the suppression of 'Rapparees, Tories, and other Robbers.' The appellation of Whig, as well as Tory, was also a nickname, and given by the opposite party in allusion to sour milk."

A Subterfuge.—In the reign of Charles II. many of the *abhorrers* (so called from professing their abhorrence of any encroachment on the royal prerogative) were seized by order of the Commons, and committed to custody. One Stowel, of Exeter, refused to obey the Sergeant-at-Arms, and said he knew of no law by which they pretended to commit him. The House, finding it equally dangerous to advance or recede, got off by an evasion. They inserted in their Journals that Stowel was indisposed, and that a month's time was allowed for the recovery of his health.—*Oldfield's History.*

Earwigging the Parliament.—*March 10th*, 1687. Most of the greate officers, both in the court and country, lords and others, were dismiss'd, as they would not promise his Majesty their consent to the repeal of the Test and Penal Statutes against Popish recusants. To this end most of the Parliament-men were spoken to in his Majesty's closset, and such as refus'd, if in any place or office of trust, civil or military, were put out of their employments. This was a time of greate trial, but hardly one of them assented.—*Evelyn's Diary.*

Freedom of Speech in Parliament. — What was thought by the House of Commons, in the reign of James II., unreasonable latitude of speech, is illustrated in the following extract from "Macaulay's History." The Commons had presented an address to the King on the subject of

infractions of the Test Act, and were met by a reprimand. On the reassembling of the House, "Wharton, the boldest and most active of the Whigs, proposed that a time should be appointed for taking his Majesty's answer into consideration. John Coke, member for Derby, though a noted Tory, seconded Wharton. 'I hope,' he said, 'that we are all Englishmen, and that we shall not be frightened from our duty by a few high words.' It was manfully, but not wisely, spoken. The whole House was in a tempest. 'Take down his words!' 'To the bar!' 'To the Tower!' resounded from every side. Those who were most lenient proposed that the offender should be reprimanded, but the ministers vehemently insisted that he should be sent to prison. The House might pardon, they said, offences committed against itself, but had no right to pardon an insult offered to the Crown. Coke was sent to the Tower."*

A Standing Danger.—On June 28th, 1689, the subject of the arrest of the Earl of Danby, then a member of the House of Commons, was discussed. He had fitted out his pleasure-yacht, and supplied it with arms. It was alleged that this was done with a view to some treasonable project. Serjeant Maynard said, in the course of his speech: "If we take notice of this, and let a member sit amongst us so accused, we cannot well answer that. We are to vote it a breach of privilege, and then inquire what those treasonable practices are. At this rate, we may all be imprisoned and whipped to our lives' end."—*Parliamentary History.*

Division Lists.—Lists of divisions were, for the first time in our history, printed and dispersed for the information of constituent bodies, at the general election in 1690.—*Macaulay.*

The Case of Ashby and White—Law versus Privilege.—The representative history of Aylesbury is the most important in the annals of Parliament, as it involves the

* Compare p. 117: "Strong Terms respecting a King's Speech."

famous case of Ashby and White, being a contest between Law and Privilege, which produced so serious a difference between the two Houses as obliged the Queen to prorogue the Parliament. Ashby had brought an action (1703) against White and others, the constables, returning officers of the borough, for not receiving his vote. The House of Commons considered the interference of a court of law, in a question which concerned the right of election, as a breach of their privilege, and ordered all the parties concerned therein—counsel, attorney, and others—to be taken into custody. Lord Chief Justice Holt was also ordered to attend the House; but, disregarding the summons, the Speaker was directed to proceed with the mace to the Court of Queen's Bench and command his attendance upon the House. The Chief Justice is said to have replied, "Mr. Speaker, if you do not depart from this court, I will commit you, though you had the whole House of Commons in your belly."—*Oldfield's History.*

A Dilemma.—The Earl of Peterborough, speaking in the House of Lords, April 14th, 1716, in opposition to the Septennial Bill, said that if this present Parliament continued beyond the time for which they were chosen, he knew not how to express the manner of their existence, unless—begging leave of that venerable bench (turning to the bishops)—they had recourse to the distinction used in the Athanasian Creed; for they would neither be made nor created, but proceeding.—*Parliamentary History.*

Expulsion of the South Sea Directors.—On the 23rd of January, 1721, the Commons, having ordered their doors to be locked and the keys to be laid on the table, summoned Sir Robert Chaplin, Bart., Sir Theodore Janssen, Bart., Mr. F. Eyles, and Mr. Sawbridge (directors of the Company), to attend in their places immediately. General Ross acquainted the House, "That they had already discovered a train of the deepest villainy and fraud that hell

ever contrived to ruin a nation." It was then agreed, *nem. con.*, that Sawbridge and Janssen be expelled the House; and on the 28th a like resolution was agreed to with respect to Chaplin and Eyles.—*Ibid.*

Paramount Dignity of Parliament.—On the 3rd of February, 1721, upon Lord Chancellor Macclesfield's not coming in time to the House, and when he came, excusing himself, "That he had been summoned to attend his Majesty at St. James's," the Lords said, "That this is an indignity offered to the House, which is undoubtedly the greatest council in the kingdom; to which all other councils ought to give way, and not that to any other."—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

Keeping the King Waiting.—"There happened within my memory," says Hatsell in his "Precedents," "and since I have been in the service of the House of Commons, a very extraordinary case, which was in the first year of his present Majesty, King George III. (on the 20th of January, 1761), where the King was actually on the Throne, and the Black Rod was coming with the message for the House of Commons to attend his Majesty; but there not being forty members present, Mr. Onslow, then Speaker, declined taking the chair, and the King was kept waiting a considerable time. The reason of this was that it was generally known that the only purpose for which the King came at that time was to give the royal assent to a Money Bill. This Bill had passed the House of Lords, but the House of Commons had received no message from the Lords to inform them that the Lords had agreed to it, and therefore till this message was received the Speaker could not take notice of their agreement, or receive or take up the Bill for the royal assent. And though the Lords' messengers were at the door, the Speaker could not, agreeable to the ancient rule and unbroken practice of the House, take the chair, for the purpose of admitting the messengers, till there

were forty members present. If the Black Rod, instead of loitering, as he did, in the passage between the Houses, had come forward and knocked at the door, the Speaker, though forty members were not present, must have immediately taken the chair and gone up to the King."

A Forty Days' Tyranny.—On the occasion of an Order in Council being promulgated to prohibit the exportation of corn (December, 1766), Lord Camden defended the proceeding in these terms:—"The necessity of a measure renders it not only excusable, but legal; and consequently a judge, when the necessity is proved, may, without hesitation, declare that act legal which would be clearly illegal where such necessity did not exist. The Crown is the sole executive power, and is therefore intrusted by the Constitution to take upon itself whatever the safety of the State may require during the recess of Parliament, *which is at most but a forty days' tyranny.*" The power exercised on this occasion was so moderate that Junius Brutus would not have hesitated to entrust it even to the discretion of a Nero.—*Lord Charlemont's Correspondence.*

Mutual Jealousy of the Two Houses.—The Speaker, in giving evidence before the Committee on House of Commons Witnesses in 1869, referring to the traditional jealousy of the two Houses, said that in 1772 Mr. Burke complained bitterly that he had been kept three hours waiting at the door of the Lords, with a Bill sent up from the Commons. The Commons were so indignant at this treatment of one of their number that, shortly afterwards, when a Bill was brought down from the Lords to impose a bounty on corn, the House rejected it by a unanimous vote. The Speaker then tossed it across the table on the floor, and a number of members rushed forward and kicked it out of the House.

The Commons and the Influence of the Crown.—On the 6th of April, 1780, Mr. Dunning moved a resolution, "That the influence of the Crown has increased, is

increasing, and ought to be diminished." Mr. Dundas (Ministerialist) moved, as an amendment, to insert before the resolution the words, "That it is now necessary to declare," &c. Lord North had on several occasions defeated the Opposition by amending the words of their motions, but on this occasion Mr. Fox dexterously accepted Mr. Dundas's words, and the resolution, instead of being weakened, was strengthened by the amendment. On the whole resolution the House divided—for, 233; against, 215; majority, 18.* The Opposition then moved and carried two other resolutions to the following effect:—"2. That it is competent to this House to examine into and to correct abuses in the expenditure of the civil list revenues, as well as in every other branch of the public revenue, whenever it shall appear expedient to the wisdom of this House so to do. 3. That it is the duty of this House to provide, as far as may be, an immediate and effectual redress of the abuses complained of in the petitions presented to this House from the different counties, cities, and towns of this kingdom." Mr. Fox moved, notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, to report the motions immediately to the House, and although Lord North exclaimed loudly against such proceedings, as violent, arbitrary, and unusual, the motion was carried.—*Earl Russell's "Life of Fox."*

The Dissolution of 1780.—A Pocket Majority.—The dissolution of the Parliament which had been elected in 1774 took place on the 1st of September, 1780. It was on this dissolution that Mr. Burke lost his seat for Bristol, and that he made the famous speech, on giving up the contest, which is to be found in his works. It was at this

* Boswell relates that having asked Dr. Johnson whether he had not been vexed by "that absurd vote of the House of Commons," "That the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished," the doctor replied, "Sir, I would have knocked the factious dogs on the head; but I was not vexed."

election also that Mr. Fox was returned for the first time for Westminster, having defeated his competitor, Lord Lincoln, by a large majority. * * * The general election did not make any great alteration in the numbers of the respective parties. Many seats were in those days in the hands of the Treasury; a number of others, making, together with the Treasury boroughs, a majority of the whole House, were in the absolute possession of individuals whose interest led them to the support of the Minister. Thus the sound of the national voice was often lost amid the corners and crannies of the House of Commons.—*Ibid.*

Creation of Peers.—In the course of the debate on the appointment of the Prince of Wales as Regent (January 22nd, 1789), Lord Camden got into a scrape, in obviating the objection to the suspension of the power of making Peers, by saying that "on any urgent call for a peerage it might be conferred by Act of Parliament"—a proceeding which appeared to their lordships so unconstitutional and republican that he was obliged to explain and retract.—*Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors."*

"All the Talents."—The death of Pitt (January 23rd, 1806) dissolved the Cabinet. The King, in spite of his antipathy to Mr. Fox, was obliged to apply to Lord Grenville to form a Ministry which he knew must include that statesman. Lord Grenville became First Lord of the Treasury; Addington, Privy Seal; Lord Erskine, Chancellor; Grey, First Lord of the Admiralty; Earl Spencer, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Windham, the three Secretaries; Lord Henry Petty, Chancellor of the Exchequer; &c. * * * The Whigs' tenure of office was much shorter than they had anticipated. They were personally odious to the King; their pretensions to superior wisdom and abilities caused them to be nicknamed "All the Talents," and Mr. Canning assailed and ridiculed them without ceasing on this head.—*Keightley's "History of England."*

The Dissolution of 1831.—Excitement in the Houses.—Earl Russell, in the introduction to his "Speeches," tells us, "Lord Grey prepared the King for the decision to which the Cabinet arrived, to advise his Majesty to have recourse to an immediate dissolution of Parliament. The King, though averse to such a proceeding, little more than six months after the general election, was disposed, at this time, to trust implicitly to Lord Grey, and I am inclined to believe the popular story, that when it appeared necessary, in order to prevent remonstrance from the House of Lords, that the King should appear in person to dissolve the Parliament, and some trifling difficulty of plaiting the horses' manes was interposed as an objection, the King said at once, 'Then I'll go down to Parliament in a hackney coach.' * * * The scenes which occurred in the two Houses of Parliament, so far as I was a witness of them, were singular and unprecedented. Before the King arrived, the House of Commons was assembled, and Sir Robert Peel and Sir Francis Burdett rose at the same time to address the House. Lord Althorp, amid the confusion and clamour of contending parties, following the precedent of Mr. Fox, moved that Sir Francis Burdett be now heard. Sir Robert Peel on the other hand, imitating a precedent of Lord North, said, 'And I rise to speak to that motion.' But instead of saying a few words, as Lord North had done, to put an end to all further debate, Sir Robert Peel quite lost his temper, and in tones of the most violent indignation attacked the impending dissolution. As he went on, the Tower guns began to fire, to announce the King's arrival, and as each discharge was heard, a loud cheer from the Government side interrupted Sir Robert Peel's declamation. Sir Henry Hardinge was heard to exclaim, 'The next time those guns are fired they will be shotted!' Presently we were all summoned to the House of Lords, where the King's presence had put a stop to a violent and unseemly discus-

sion. The King in his speech announced the dissolution, and retired to unrobe. The scene that followed was one of great excitement and confusion." Mr. Duncombe, in the Life of his father, says, "The change that had taken place in April, 1831, excited both the great parties equally. In the Commons the speech of Sir Robert Peel was interrupted by the sound of the cannon announcing the arrival of the King; every report elicited a burst of cheering from one side, and of yells and groans from the other. In the Lords the scene was equally extravagant, Lord Mansfield in his anger doubling up his fist, elbowing Lord Shaftesbury into the chair, and hooting Lord Brougham as he left the House."

Jewish Disabilities.—In 1849, Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild was returned as one of the members for the City of London. None could question his return; no law affirmed his incapacity; then how was he excluded? By an oath designed for Roman Catholics, whose disabilities had been removed. He sat there for two sessions in expectation of relief from the legislature, but being again disappointed he resolved to try his rights under the existing law. Accordingly, in 1850, he presented himself at the table for the purpose of taking the oaths. Having been allowed, after some discussion, to be sworn upon the Old Testament (the form most binding upon his conscience), he proceeded to take the oaths. The oaths of allegiance and supremacy were taken in the accustomed form; but from the oath of abjuration he omitted the words, "on the true faith of a Christian," as not binding on his conscience. He was immediately directed to withdraw; when, after many learned arguments, it was resolved that he was not entitled to sit or vote until he had taken the oath of abjuration in the form appointed by law. In 1851 a more resolute effort was made to overcome the obstacle offered by the oath of abjuration. Mr. Alderman

Salomons, a Jew, having been returned for the borough of Greenwich, omitted from the oath the words which were the Jews' stumbling-block. Treating these words as immaterial, he took the entire substance of the oath, with the proper solemnities. He was directed to withdraw; but on a later day, while his case was under discussion, he came into the House and took his seat within the bar, whence he declined to withdraw until he was removed by the Sergeant-at-Arms. The House agreed to a resolution in the same form as in the case of Baron de Rothschild. In the meantime, however, he had not only sat in the House, but had voted in three divisions. * * * In 1858 the Lords, yielding to the persuasion of the Conservative premier, Lord Derby, agreed to a concession. A bill passed by the Commons at once removed the only legal obstacle to the admission of the Jews to Parliament. To this general enfranchisement the Lords declined to assent; but they allowed either House, by resolution, to omit the excluding words from the oath of abjuration. The Lords' amendments found little favour with the Commons, but they were accepted under protest, and the bill was passed. * * * The House of Commons was indeed open to the Jew; but he came as a suppliant. Two years later the scandal was corrected, and the Jew, though still holding his title by a standing order of the Commons, and not under the law, acquired a permanent settlement.—*May's "Constitutional History."*

Hereditary Representatives. — It is remarked in *Notes and Queries* that nearly 230 years have passed since the election of the Long Parliament, and yet we see many of the names reappearing in the Reformed Parliament of Queen Victoria, as representatives of towns in the same districts, and, in some cases, of precisely the same places. Thus, an Ashton (Assheton) then, as now, represented Clithero; a Corbett, Shropshire; a Knightley, Northampton; a Lloyd, Cardigan; a Montagu, Huntingdonshire; a Morgan, Breck-

nockshire; a Newport, Shropshire; a Noel, Rutlandshire; a Parker, Suffolk; a Russell, Tavistock; and a Whitmore, Bridgenorth. The same paper gives a list of fifty members in 1869, who were, so far as could be ascertained, the direct lineal descendants of those who sat in the Long Parliament in 1640.

"The Rolliad."

This celebrated collection of Parliamentary squibs, which is a sort of burlesque criticism on an imaginary poem, appeared in 1785. A full list of the authors, with their various contributions, is given by Lord Braybrooke (from a marked copy in his possession) in the first series of *Notes and Queries*. "While Mr. Fox," says Earl Russell, "wearied with strife, was inclined to recruit his strength in the delightful shades of St. Ann's, the followers of the mighty warrior covered his retreat with the sharp missiles of wit and fun. A cloud of arrows flying around made the supporters of the the Minister (Pitt) smart with pain, at once triumphant and ridiculous. 'The Rolliad,' or 'Criticisms on the Rolliad,' as it is more properly called, is the quiver of this squadron of wits." The origin of the title is thus explained by Moore in his "Life of Sheridan":—"Mr. Rolle (M.P. for Devonshire), the hero of 'The Rolliad,' was one of those unlucky persons whose destiny it is to be immortalised by ridicule, and to whom the world owes the same sort of gratitude for the wit of which they were the butts, as the merchants did in Sinbad's story, to those pieces of meat to which diamonds adhered. The chief offence, besides his political obnoxiousness, by which he provoked this satirical warfare (whose plan of attack was all arranged at a club held at Becket's), was the lead which he took in a sort of conspiracy, formed on the ministerial benches, to interrupt, by coughing, hawking, and other unseemly noises, the speeches of Mr. Burke. The chief writers of these lively productions were Tickell,

General Fitzpatrick, Lord John Townshend, Richardson, George Ellis and Dr. Laurence."

The interruptions referred to by Moore are thus alluded to in the work :—

> "Great Rollo's heir, whose cough, whose laugh, whose groan,
> Th' Antæus Edmund has so oft o'erthrown;
> Whose cry of 'Question' silenced Charles's sense,
> That cry, more powerful than Pitt's eloquence."

Pitt and his principal supporters, with their Parliamentary characteristics, are portrayed in sarcastic lines. Thus "the Heaven-born Minister"—

> "Above the rest, majestically great,
> Behold the infant Atlas of the State;
> The matchless miracle of modern days,
> In whom Britannia to the world displays
> A sight to make surrounding nations stare;
> A kingdom trusted to a school-boy's care."

He is, again, the subject of the following :—

> "Pert without fire, without experience sage;
> Young, with more art than Shelburne glean'd from age;
> Too proud from pilfer'd greatness to descend,
> Too humble not to call Dundas his friend;
> In solemn dignity and sullen state
> This new Octavius rises to debate."

His eloquence is described in terms scarcely more complimentary :—

> "Crown the froth'd porter, slay the fatted ox,
> And give the British meal to British Fox.
> But, for an Indian Minister more fit,
> Ten cups of purest padrae pour for Pitt,
> Pure as himself; add sugar, too, and cream,
> Sweet as his temper, bland as flows the stream
> Of his smooth eloquence; then crisply nice
> The muffin toast, or bread and butter slice,
> Thin as his arguments, that mock the mind,
> Gone ere you taste—no relish left behind."

The Speaker of the House is feelingly commiserated:—

> "There Cornwall sits, and oh, unhappy fate!
> Must sit for ever through the long debate.
> Painful pre-eminence! he hears, 'tis true,
> Fox, North, and Burke, but hears Sir Joseph too."

Among the small fry of Parliament, one of the best of the touches is that bestowed upon

> "Drake, whose cold rhetoric freezes in its course."

"How happy," continue the "Criticisms," "is the allusion to Mr. Drake's well-known speech, which, in the metaphor of our poet, we may style a beautiful icicle of the most transparent eloquence: 'Behold, sir, another feature of the procrastinating system. Not so the Athenian patriots—Sir, the Romans—Sir, I have lost the clue of my argument—Sir, I will sit down.'"

Another honourable gentleman is made the subject of some sparkling lines, with the explanation that they refer to "an active young member, who has upon all occasions been pointedly severe upon the noble lord in the blue ribbon (North), and who is remarkable for never having delivered his sentiments upon any subject, whether relating to the East Indies, the Reform of Parliament, or the Westminster Election, without a copious dissertation upon the principles, causes, and conduct of the American War":—

> "Lo! Beaufoy rises, friend to soft repose,
> Whose gentle accents prompt the House to dose.
> His cadence just a general sleep provokes,
> Almost as quickly as Sir Richard's* jokes.
> Thy slumbers, North, he strives in vain to break;
> When all are sleeping, thou wouldst scarce awake,
> Though from his lips severe invectives fell,
> Sharp as the acids he delights to sell."

In allusion to the last line, the reader is informed of

* Sir Richard Hill.

Mr. Beaufoy that, "although the elegance of his diction and smoothness of his manner partake of the properties of oil, he is, in his commercial capacity, a dealer in vinegar."

But the patrician Pittite is equally the subject of sarcasm with the trader. The Marquis of Graham had said in debate, "If the honourable gentleman calls my honourable friend goose, I suppose he will call me gosling." The remark was received with significant cheers. The marquis shortly after was elected Chancellor of Glasgow University, and he is thus referred to:—

> "If right the bard, whose numbers sweetly flow,
> That all our knowledge is ourselves to know,
> A sage like Graham can the world produce,
> Who in full senate called himself a goose?
> Th' admiring Commons from the high-born youth
> With wonder heard this undisputed truth;
> Exulting Glasgow claim'd him for her own,
> And placed the prodigy on learning's throne."

PART II.

PERSONAL ANECDOTES.

HENRY ADDINGTON.

RESPECTABLE MEDIOCRITY.—Henry Addington (Viscount Sidmouth) was nicknamed "the Doctor," his father having been physician to the elder Pitt. Earl Russell says of him, in his "Life of Fox," "He was a man of average understanding, equal to the requirements of quiet times, of respectable prejudices, and undoubted courage; but as minister for a great emergency he excited only ridicule and contempt. Little could he withstand the daily epigrams of Canning and the scarcely more endurable compassion of Sheridan:—

'As London is to Paddington,
So is Pitt to Addington.'

'When his speeches lag most vilely,
Cheer him, cheer him, Brother Hiley;
When his speeches vilely lag,
Cheer him, cheer him, Brother Bragge.'

'The Pells* for his son, the pills for himself.'

These and a thousand other arrows which wit squandered upon Addington utterly ruined him in public opinion."

A SHEEP IN WOLF'S CLOTHING.—A few days before the declaration of war with France, in 1803, a warlike

* The sinecure of Clerk of the Pells.

message from the Crown was sent to Parliament. Addington, then being minister, appeared in the full dress of the Windsor uniform, and strutted up the House in the midst of a burst of laughter, just as the Speaker was reading a medicine bill. "It must have been on this occasion," says Earl Russell, "that Sheridan redoubled the laughter of the House by saying, 'The right hon. gentleman who has appeared this evening in the character of a sheep in wolf's clothing,' &c. In fact, nothing could be more tragical than the occasion, nothing more comical than the chief actor in the tragedy."

A Royal Appeal.—Mr. Addington used to tell his friends that at the interview with which he was honoured on the 10th of May, 1804, the King again pressed upon him the acceptance of the peerage and pension, in terms which it must have been very difficult for so devoted a subject to resist:—"You are a proud man, Mr. Addington, but I am a proud man, too; and why should I sleep uneasy on my pillow because you will not comply with my request? Why should I feel the consciousness that I have suffered you to ruin your family, and that through your attachment to me?" —*Sidmouth's Life and Correspondence.*

Spoiling Nature.—On the 8th of June, 1789, Addington, who had just completed his thirty-second year, was elevated to the dignity of Speaker of the House of Commons. Mr. Gilpin, in a congratulatory note, writes on that occasion: "I was in some little pain at first how you could restrain the natural modesty of your disposition on so sudden an elevation to one of the most awful posts I know; but Sir John Dayley and other gentlemen gave such an account of your setting out, that all apprehensions for you are now over; and I have only to regret, as a picturesque man, that such an enlightened countenance as God Almighty has given you should be shrouded in a bush of horsehair." —*Ibid.*

JOSEPH ADDISON.

Successful Silence.—Addison sat for Malmsbury in the House of Commons which was elected in 1708. But the House of Commons was not the field for him; the bashfulness of his nature made his wit and eloquence useless in debate. He once rose, but could not overcome his diffidence, and ever after remained silent. Nobody can think it strange that a great writer should fail as a speaker; but many, probably, will think it strange that Addison's failure as a speaker should have had no unfavourable effect on his success as a politician. In our time a man of high rank and great fortune might, though speaking very little and very ill, hold a considerable post; but it would now be inconceivable that a mere adventurer—a man who, when out of office, must live by his pen—should in a few years become successively Under Secretary of State, Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Secretary of State, without some oratorical talent. Addison, without high birth, and with little property, rose to a post which dukes—the heads of the great houses of Talbot, Russell, and Bentinck—have thought it an honour to fill. Without opening his lips in debate, he rose to a post the highest that Chatham or Fox ever reached; and this he did before he had been nine years in Parliament.—*Macaulay's Essay on Addison.*

SIR ANDREW AGNEW.

Quizzing a Bill out of the House.—Sir Andrew Agnew was identified in the House of Commons with the question of Sabbath observance. He brought in a measure so extreme in its nature that his friends appealed to his judgment in private against such a scheme. Professor Pryme tells us, "He said, 'I quite agree with you as to the absurdity of some of the enactments, but it is the bill of the

Society for the Better Observance of the Sabbath, and I cannot help it.' It was lost, of course, because it went too far, but the discussion produced great good throughout the kingdom, in leading people of all classes to attend to the subject, and improve the observance of the Lord's Day. The last time that Sir A. Agnew brought forward his bill, Mr. Hawes, M.P. for Lambeth, and two or three other members, succeeded in, I may say, quizzing it out of the House. We were in committee of the whole House, and I was in the chair. When we came to that clause which enacted that it should be unlawful for any cab or public carriage to be let out upon a Sunday, Hawes moved as an amendment, 'or for any private carriage to be used.' Before putting it to the vote, Sir A. Agnew appealed to me not to do so. I answered that, as it had been moved and seconded gravely, I had no option. The clause was carried by a majority, and no more was heard of the bill."—*Pryme's "Autobiographic Recollections."*

BISHOP ATTERBURY.

Balaam and his Ass.—Atterbury, the celebrated Bishop of Rochester, happened to say in the House of Lords, while speaking on a certain bill then under discussion, that "he had prophesied last winter this bill would be attempted in the present session, and he was sorry to find he had proved a true prophet." My Lord Coningsby, who spoke after the bishop, and always spoke in a passion, desired the House to remark that one of the right reverend had set himself forth as a prophet; but, for his part, he did not know what prophet to liken him to, unless to that furious prophet Balaam, who was reproved by his own ass." Atterbury, in reply, with great wit and calmness, exposed this rude attack, concluding thus: "Since the noble lord has discovered in our manners such a similitude, I am well content to be

compared to the prophet Balaam; but, my lords, I am at a loss how to make out the other part of the parallel. I am sure that I have been reproved by nobody but his lordship." —*Dr. King's Anecdotes of his own Times.*

LORD BACON.

Depopulation.—Bacon was returned to the Parliament that met in 1597, when he introduced two bills against "enclosures and the depopulation of towns." In his speech introducing his bills he said, "I should be sorry to see within this kingdom that piece of Ovid's verse prove true—*Jam seges ubi Troja fuit:* In England nought but green fields, a shepherd, and a dog."—*Parliamentary History.*

A Repentant Patriot.—Bacon tried to play a very difficult game in politics. He wished to be at once a favourite at Court and popular with the multitude. * * * Once, however, he indulged in a burst of patriotism which cost him a long and bitter remorse, and which he never ventured to repeat. The Court asked for large subsidies and for speedy payment. The remains of Bacon's speech breathe all the spirit of the Long Parliament. "The gentlemen," said he, "must sell their plate, and the farmers their brass pots, ere this will be paid; and for us, we are here to search the wounds of the realm, and not to skin them over. The dangers are these. First, we shall breed discontent, and endanger her Majesty's safety, which must consist more in the love of the people than their wealth. Secondly, this being granted in this sort, other princes hereafter will look for the like; so that we shall put an evil precedent on ourselves and our posterity; and in histories, it is to be observed, of all nations the English are not to be subject, base, or taxable." The Queen and her ministers resented this outbreak of public spirit in the highest manner. Indeed, many an honest member of the House of Commons had, for

a much smaller matter, been sent to the Tower by the proud and hot-blooded Tudors. The young patriot endeavoured to make the most abject apologies, and never offended in the same manner again.—*Macaulay's Essay on Bacon.*

Exemplary Oratory.—Ben Jonson writes of Bacon, in his "Discoveries made upon Men and Matter":—"There happened in my time one noble speaker who was full of gravity in his speaking. His language, when he could spare or pass by a jest, was nobly censorious. No man ever spoke more neatly, more pressly, more weightily, or suffered less emptiness, less idleness, in what he uttered. No member of his speech but consisted of his own graces. His hearers could not cough or look aside from him without loss. He commanded where he spoke, and had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion. No man had their affections more in his power. The fear of every man that heard him was *lest he should make an end.*"

SIR JOHN BARNARD.

Price of a City Member.—Barnard took his seat for the City of London in 1722. To Walpole's frequent observation, "Every man has his price," it was once triumphantly objected, "What, then, is Sir John Barnard's?" "Popularity," was the minister's reply.—*Memoirs of Sir J. Barnard.*

A Recognition.—Walpole once paid Sir J. Barnard a great compliment. Riding out on the same day in two parties, they happened to come where only a narrow close prevented their view of each other. Sir J. Barnard, talking with his company, was overheard. A gentleman of the other party said, "Whose voice is that?" Sir Robert replied, "Do not you know? It is one I shall never forget; I have often felt its power."—*Ibid.*

LORD GEORGE BENTINCK.

A Sacrifice.—On the day after the Derby, 1848 (says Mr. Disraeli), the writer met Lord George Bentinck in the library of the House of Commons. He was standing before the book-shelves, with a volume in his hand, and his countenance was greatly disturbed. His resolutions in favour of the colonial interest, after all his labours, had been negatived by the committee on the 22nd, and on the 24th his horse Surplice, whom he had parted with among the rest of his stud, solely that he might pursue without distraction his labours on behalf of the great interests of the country, had won that paramount and Olympian stake to gain which had been the object of his life. He had nothing to console him, and nothing to sustain him except his pride. Even that deserted him before a heart which he knew at least could yield him sympathy. He gave a sort of superb groan: "All my life I have been trying for this, and for what have I sacrificed it?" he murmured. It was in vain to offer solace. "You do not know what the Derby is," he moaned out. "Yes, I do; it is the blue ribbon of the turf." "It is the blue ribbon of the turf," he slowly repeated to himself, and sitting down at the table, he buried himself in a folio of statistics.—*Life of Bentinck.*

LORD BOLINGBROKE.

Evanescence of Parliamentary Eloquence before the Days of Reporting.—In the case of Bolingbroke (remarks Lord Brougham), the defect, so often to be deplored in contemplating the history of modern oratory, attains its very height. Meagre as are the materials by which we can aim at forming to ourselves some idea of the eloquence of most men who flourished before our own day; scanty as are the remains even of the speakers who figured during the

Seven Years' War, and the earlier part of the American contest—when we go back to the administration of Walpole we find those vestiges to be yet more thinly scattered over the pages of our history; and in Queen Anne's time, during which alone Bolingbroke spoke, there are absolutely none. It is correct to affirm that of this great orator—one of the very greatest, according to all contemporary history, that ever exercised the art, and these accounts are powerfully supported by his writings—not a spoken sentence remains. * * The contemplation of this chasm it was that made Mr. Pitt, when musing upon its brink, and calling to mind all that might be fancied of the orator from the author, and all that traditional testimony had handed down to us, sigh after a speech of Bolingbroke—desiderating it far more than the restoration of all that has perished of the treasures of the ancient world.—*Statesmen of the Time of George III.* The impression produced by Bolingbroke is shown in the Earl of Chesterfield's remark to his son:—"I would much rather that you had Lord Bolingbroke's style and eloquence, in speaking and writing, than all the learning of the Academy of Sciences, the Royal Society, and the two Universities united."

MR. BRIGHT.

The Cave of Adullam.—On the meeting of Parliament in 1866, a Reform Bill was introduced by Earl Russell's administration. Several members usually found in the ranks of the Liberal party either opposed or withheld their support from the measure. Among them Mr. Lowe and Mr. Horsman were most conspicuous. In a debate on the bill, on the 13th of March, the following observations by Mr. Bright excited great merriment, and gave the name of "Adullamites" to this section of politicians:—"The right honourable gentleman below me (Mr. Horsman) said a little against the

Government and a little against the bill, but had last night a field-night for an attack upon so humble an individual as I am. The right honourable gentleman is the first of the new party who has expressed his great grief, who has retired into what may be called his political cave of Adullam, and he has called about him every one that was in distress and every one that was discontented.* The right honourable gentleman has been anxious to form a party in this House. There is scarcely any one on this side of the House who is able to address the House with effect, or to take much part in our debates, whom he has not tried to bring over to his party or cabal; and at last the right honourable gentleman has succeeded in hooking the right honourable gentleman the member for Calne (Mr. Lowe). I know there was an opinion expressed many years ago by a member of the Treasury bench and of the Cabinet, that two men would make a party. When a party is formed of two men so amiable, so discreet as the two right honourable gentlemen, we may hope to see for the first time in Parliament a party perfectly harmonious, and distinguished by mutual and unbroken trust. But there is one difficulty which it is impossible to remove. This party of two reminds me of the Scotch terrier, which was so covered with hair that you could not tell which was the head and which was the tail of it."

The "Intense Glare at the Doors of Parliament."—Mr. Bright used this expression in a speech on Reform, at Birmingham, in 1865. Alluding to the fear which the Tories and many of the Whigs entertained of a Reform Bill, he said, "What is this apparition which alarms them? * * * They are afraid of the five or six millions of Englishmen, grown-up men, who are allowed to marry, to keep house, to rear children, who are expected to earn

* 1 Samuel xxii. 1, 2.

their living, who pay taxes, who must obey the law, who must be citizens in all honourable conduct—they are afraid of the five or six millions who by the present system of representation are shut out, and insultingly shut out, from the commonest rights of citizenship. It may happen, as it happened thirty years ago, that the eyes of the five millions all through the United Kingdom may be fixed with an intense glare upon the doors of Parliament; it was so in the years 1831-32. * * * If the five millions should once unitedly fix their eyes with an intense look upon the doors of that House where my hon. friend and I expect so soon to enter, I would ask, Who shall say them nay? Not the mace upon the table of the House; not the four hundred easy gentlemen of the House of Lords, who lounge in and out of that decorated chamber; not the dozen gentlemen who call themselves statesmen, and who meet in Downing Street; perhaps not even those more appalling and more menacing personages who have their lodgment higher up Whitehall. I say there is no power in the country, as opinion now stands, and as combination is now possible—there is no power in this country that can say 'Nay' for one single week to the five millions, if they are intent upon making their way within the doors of Parliament."

A Parliament from Temple Bar.—In a speech on Reform at Glasgow, in 1866, Mr. Bright made this supposition:—"If the Clerk of the House of Commons were placed at Temple Bar, and if he had orders to tap upon the shoulder every well-dressed and apparently cleanly-washed man who passed through that ancient bar, until he had numbered 658; and if the Crown summoned these 658 to be the Parliament of the United Kingdom, my honest conviction is that you would have a better Parliament than now exists. This assertion will stagger some timid and some good men; but let me explain myself to you. It would be a Parliament every member of which

would have no direct constituency, but it would be a Parliament that would act as a jury, that would take some heed of the facts and arguments laid before it. It would be free, at any rate, from the class prejudices which weigh upon the present House of Commons. It would be free from the overshadowing presence of what are called noble families. It would owe no allegiance to great landowners, and I hope it would have fewer men amongst it seeking their own gains by entering Parliament."

The Derby Minstrels.—Speaking on Reform at Birmingham in 1866, Mr. Bright made an allusion which told in a circle beyond his audience:—"The Government of Lord Derby in the House of Commons, sitting all in a row, reminds me very much of a number of amusing and ingenious gentlemen whom I dare say some of you have seen and listened to; I mean the Christy Minstrels. The Christy Minstrels, if I am not misinformed, are, when they are clean washed, white men; but they come before the audience as black as the blackest negroes, and by this transformation it is expected that their jokes and songs will be more amusing. The Derby minstrels pretend to be Liberal and white; but the fact is, if you come nearer and examine them closely, you will find them to be just as black and curly as the Tories have ever been. I do not know, and I do not pretend to say, which of them it is that plays the banjo and which the bones."

A Heavy Burden.—In the debate on the Queen's Message announcing the declaration of war with Russia, March, 1854, Mr. Bright condemned the policy of a war on behalf of Turkey, and in the course of his remarks said, "The property-tax is the lever, or the weapon, with which the proprietors of land and houses in this kingdom will have to support the 'integrity and independence' of the Ottoman Empire. Gentlemen, I congratulate you that every man of you has a Turk upon his shoulders."

Always a "Weak Brother" in the House.—During the debate on the Lords' amendments to the Reform Bill, in 1867, Mr. Bright spoke against the representation of minorities, and remarked: "I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was a scheme to introduce into the House all sorts of crotchety people. I have no objection to crotchety people. I believe there must be all sorts of people in this House. I have never been in any Parliament in which there has not been at least one member generally believed by the rest of the members to be not quite strong, and excuses were made for his eccentric conduct because he was not as responsible as others. That, probably, will always be the case in the House of Commons."—*Speeches, edited by Professor Rogers.*

LORD BROUGHAM.

Irrepressible Speech.—Brougham failed in getting into Parliament till the beginning of 1810, when he was elected for Camelford. He was expected to fire off an oration the very night he took his seat, but he had made a vow not to speak for a month, and he kept it. "It was remarked" (writes Campbell) "that for the future he never was in his place a whole evening, in either House of Parliament, without, regularly or irregularly, more than once taking part in the discussions." This is a little overstated; but his oratory was irrepressible, and he would have suffered from suppressed speech as another man might suffer from suppressed gout. Although his first attempt was a failure, he soon fought his way to the front, and by the end of his first session was competing for the leadership of the Opposition, then held by the Right Hon. George Ponsonby, Ex-Chancellor of Ireland. * * * Careless whether his claim to the leadership was formally recognised or not, he took the lead on so many important questions that the general

public could not well help regarding him as leader, and the recalcitrant Whigs gradually succumbed to him.—*Quarterly Review.*

"Broffam" *versus* "Broom."—Brougham did not get into regular practice at the bar till he had acquired celebrity in the House of Commons. He got a few Scotch appeals, and these brought him into early conflict with Lord Eldon, who persisted in calling him Mr. *Broffam*, till a formal remonstrance arrived through the assistant-clerk; whereupon the Chancellor gave in, and complimented the offended counsel at the conclusion of the argument, saying, "Every authority upon the question has been brought before us: new Brooms sweep clean."—*Ibid.*

His Attack upon Canning.—Brougham took part in the debate on the Roman Catholic claims, April 17, 1823, and in the course of his speech said, referring to Canning, he "had exhibited a specimen, the most incredible specimen, of monstrous truckling, for the purpose of obtaining office, that the whole history of political tergiversation could furnish——" Mr. Secretary Canning: "I rise to say that that is false." The Speaker (after a perfect silence in the House during some seconds) said, in a low tone, he hoped the right honourable Secretary would retract the expression he had used. An individual of his high rank and station could not fail to be aware that such an expression was a complete violation of the customs and of the orders of the House. He deeply regretted that, even in haste, it should have been used. Mr. Canning said he was sorry to have used any word which was a violation of the decorum of the House; but nothing—no consideration on earth—should induce him to retract the sentiment. After an appeal to the House on the part of the Speaker, Mr. Canning expressed his regret, so far as the orders of the House were concerned, to have attracted their displeasure; but he could not in conscience recall his declaration. Some further discussion

ensued, when Mr. Bankes moved, "That the Right Honourable George Canning and Henry Brougham, Esq., be committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms attending this House." Mr. Brougham opposed the motion, pointing out that with the unanimous assent of the House it had been declared by the highest authority that Mr. Canning had committed a breach of their rules; and it was proposed by the motion to take himself also into custody, who had committed no offence whatever against the orders of the House. He admitted their power to take such a step if they chose, but declared if they did so it would be in flagrant violation of the principles of justice. He begged the House to understand he opposed the first part of the motion no less than the last. He would be the last man to hold up his hand for passing a censure upon the right honourable gentleman, or for committing him to custody for the expression which he had used on hearing one half of the sentence which was about to be delivered. Ultimately Mr. Canning — Mr. Bankes having withdrawn his motion—said he should think no more of the matter; and Mr. Brougham similarly expressing himself, the affair terminated.—*Hansard.*

"The Schoolmaster Abroad."—The debate on the Address on the King's Speech which took place in the House of Commons January 29th, 1828, was one of an unusually animated character, in consequence of the Duke of Wellington having resigned his office of Commander-in-Chief and formed a new Administration by command of his Majesty. Brougham confessed that he felt a very great degree of objection to the arrangement. There was in it, he said, no security or compensation to the House or to the country for this union of power. He had no fear, however, of slavery being introduced into this country by the power of the sword. It would take a stronger, it would demand a more powerful man even than the Duke of Wellington to effect such an object. These were not the

times for such an attempt. There had been periods when the country heard with dismay that "the soldier was abroad." Now there was another person abroad—a less important person—in the eyes of some an insignificant person—whose labours had tended to produce this state of things. The schoolmaster was abroad! And he trusted more to the schoolmaster armed with his primer, than he did to the soldier in full military array, for upholding and extending the liberties of his country.—*Ibid.*

A Noble Boast.—Brougham's speech in the House of Commons on Law Reform, in February, 1828, was one of the most effective he ever delivered. The *Quarterly Review* says of it that, "directly or indirectly, it has probably led to a greater number of important and beneficial results than any other speech, ancient or modern." He spoke on this occasion for six hours, and concluded thus: "It was the boast of Augustus—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost—that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble; a praise not unworthy a great prince, and to which the present reign also has its claims. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book, left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence."

Fawning Parasites.—When Lord Althorp moved an amendment to the motion for adjournment in the House of Commons (1830), Brougham "launched out against the Ministry in a strain of bitter invective, of sarcasm vehement even to fierceness." Mr. Roebuck ("Whig Ministry of 1830") gives the following passage from his speech, which called forth an indignant protest from Sir Robert Peel:—"You will see in this, as in that country (France), that the day of force is now over, and that he who would rule his

country by an appeal to royal favour or military power may be overwhelmed, may be hurled down by it, if he should entertain such an idea—and I in no wise accuse him of such an attempt; him I accuse not; I——" and here the excited orator stretched out his long bony arm, and pointed with a lean and almost skeleton finger at the Treasury bench, "I accuse you, I accuse his flatterers—those mean, fawning parasites——" Sir Robert rose at once, and, in grave indignant terms, called the learned gentleman to order. "I ask the honourable and learned gentleman, as I am one of those sitting on this side of the House, whether he means to accuse me of being a fawning parasite?" Checked thus suddenly in mid-career, Mr. Brougham seemed at once to perceive that the phrase he had used and the charge he had brought were not to be justified, and instantly, therefore, disclaimed every intention of applying the words to Sir Robert Peel himself, who truly observed, on this retractation, that it was hardly sufficient, and declared that he would therefore, on behalf of Mr. Brougham, make the apology and retractation which ought to have been made by the learned gentleman. This he did, and Mr. Brougham with great good sense and good feeling adopted it.

His Election for Yorkshire.—Campbell, in his "Life of Brougham," thus speaks of his contest for the representation of the county of York, in 1830:—"No man ever went through such fatigue of body and mind as he did for the three following weeks. The assizes at York were about to begin, and he chanced to have a good many retainers. Instead of giving these up, he appeared in court and exerted himself as an advocate with more than wonted spirit. Having finished an address to the jury, he would throw off his wig and gown, and make a speech to the electors in the Castle yard on "the three glorious days of Paris," and the way in which the people of England might peaceably obtain still greater advantages. He would then return to court and

reply' in a cause respecting right of common of turbary, having, in the twinkling of an eye, picked up from his junior a notion of all that had passed in his absence. But, what is much more extraordinary, before the nomination day arrived, he had held public meetings and delivered stirring speeches in every town and large village within the county; still day by day addressing juries, and winning or losing verdicts. * * * County elections at that time, lasting fifteen days, excited prodigious interest. All England looked with eagerness on this contest, and, when Brougham's return was actually proclaimed, the triumph was said to form a grand epoch in the history of Parliamentary representation."

A Maternal Preference.—Brougham, after his elevation to the woolsack (representing the county of York at the time), like a pious son—"as he ever showed himself," says Lord Campbell—took a journey to Brougham Hall, to visit his venerable mother, and, kneeling before her, to ask her blessing on a Lord Chancellor. The good old lady still preserved her fine faculties quite entire; but while she reciprocated her boy's affection for her, and was proud of his abilities and the distinction he had acquired, she said, with excellent good sense and feeling, "My dear Harry, I would rather have embraced the member for Yorkshire; but God Almighty bless you!"

Interview of Earl Grey and Lord Brougham with the King.—At the Cabinet Council which was held April 22nd, 1831, immediately after the defeat of the Government on the Reform question, it was resolved to advise the King to prorogue Parliament with a view to an early dissolution. Earl Grey and Lord Brougham were deputed to wait on his Majesty and communicate to him the advice of the Cabinet. The interview which these ministers had with King William, in discharge of their mission, is thus described by Mr. Molesworth ("History of the Reform Bill"):—The Chancellor approached the

subject very carefully, prefacing the disagreeable message with which he was charged with a compliment on the King's desire to promote the welfare of his people. He then proceeded to communicate the advice of the Cabinet, adding that they were unanimous in offering it. "What! exclaimed the King, "would you have me dismiss in this summary manner a Parliament that has granted me so splendid a civil list, and given my Queen so liberal an annuity in case she survives me?" "No doubt, sire," Lord Brougham replied, "in these respects they have acted wisely and honourably; but your Majesty's advisers are all of opinion that, in the present state of affairs, every hour that this Parliament continues to sit is pregnant with danger to the peace and security of your kingdom, and they humbly beseech your Majesty to go down this very day and prorogue it; if you do not, they cannot be answerable for the consequences." The King was greatly embarrassed; he evidently entertained the strongest objection to the proposed measure, but he also felt the danger which would result from the resignation of his ministers at the present crisis. He therefore shifted his ground, and asked, "Who is to carry the sword of state and the cap of maintenance?" "Sire, knowing the urgency of the crisis and the imminent peril in which the country at this moment stands, we have ventured to tell those whose duty it is to perform these and other similar offices, to hold themselves in readiness." "But the troops—the Life Guards; I have given no orders to have them called out, and now it is too late." This was, indeed, a serious objection; for to call out the Guards was the special prerogative of the monarch himself, and no minister had any right to order their attendance without his express command. "Sire," replied the Chancellor, with some hesitation, "we must throw ourselves on your indulgence. Deeply feeling the gravity of the crisis, and knowing your love for your people, we have taken a liberty which nothing but the

most imperious necessity could warrant; we have ordered out the troops, and we humbly throw ourselves on your Majesty's indulgence." The King's eye flashed, and his cheek became crimson; he was evidently on the point of dismissing the ministry in an explosion of anger. "Why, my lords," he exclaimed, "this is treason!—high treason! and you, my Lord Chancellor, ought to know that it is." "Yes, sire, I do know it; and nothing but the strongest conviction that your Majesty's crown and the interests of the nation are at stake could have induced us to take such a step, or to tender the advice we are now giving." This submissive reply had the desired effect: the King cooled; his prudence and better genius prevailed; and having once made up his mind to yield, he yielded with a good grace. He accepted, without any objection, the speech which had been prepared for him, and which the two ministers had brought with them; he gave orders respecting the details of the approaching ceremonial, and, having completely recovered his habitual serenity and good humour, he dismissed the two lords with a jocose threat of impeachment.

His Reform Speech in the Lords.—On the second reading of the Reform Bill, in October, 1831, Brougham delivered his great speech in defence of it, which (says Lord Campbell) "by many was considered his *chef-d'œuvre*. It certainly was a wonderful performance to witness. He showed a most stupendous memory, and extraordinary dexterity in handling the weapons both of ridicule and of reason. Without a note to refer to, he went through all the speeches of his opponents delivered during the five nights' debate, analysing them successively, and, with a little aid from perversion, giving them all a seemingly triumphant answer. * * * The peroration was partly inspired by draughts of mulled port, imbibed by him very copiously towards the conclusion of the four hours during which he was on his legs or on his knees. * * * 'I pray and I exhort you

not to reject this measure. By all you hold most dear; by all the ties that bind every one of us to our common order and our common country, I solemnly adjure you—I warn you—I implore you—yea, on my bended knees [he kneels] I supplicate you—reject not this bill!' He continued for some time as if in prayer; but his friends, alarmed for him lest he should be suffering from the effects of the mulled port, picked him up and placed him safely on the woolsack. Like Burke's famous dagger scene in the House of Commons, this prostration was a failure; so unsuited was it to the spectators and to the actor, that it produced a sensation of ridicule, and considerably impaired the effect of a speech displaying wonderful powers of memory and of intellect."

Asserting a "Right."—The House of Lords went into committee on the Abolition of Slavery Bill, August 14th, 1833, when the Lord Chancellor (Brougham), opposing an amendment of the Duke of Wellington, said that a slave who had been freed "would have as good a right to sit in the other House of Parliament as the noble duke opposite (the Duke of Wellington), who was illustrious by his actions, or the illustrious duke near him (the Duke of Cumberland), who was illustrious by the courtesy of that House." The Duke of Cumberland rose to order; he had not said one word to call for such an attack. The Lord Chancellor said that the illustrious duke was out of order, and in calling him to order was most disorderly. The Duke of Cumberland again rose, and protested that the noble and learned lord had no cause whatever to address him. The Lord Chancellor said, the illustrious duke was most disorderly in calling him to order on the score of having addressed the illustrious duke. He had a right to address any one of their lordships. He had exercised the right of addressing the members of the other House for twenty years, and, please God, he would continue to exercise that right as regarded their lordships.—*Hansard.*

Seal Fishing.—Brougham had been very sanguine in his opposition to the bill for repealing the Navigation Laws, in 1849, and was deeply mortified when it passed both Houses. "While the bill was depending," says Lord Campbell, "I happened to call upon him one morning, in Grafton Street, to talk to him about a Scotch appeal, and was shown into his library. He soon rushed in very eagerly, but suddenly stopped short, exclaiming 'Lord bless me! is it you? They told me it was Stanley.' And notwithstanding his accustomed frank and courteous manner, I had some difficulty in fixing his attention. In the evening I stepped across the House to the Opposition Bench, where Brougham and Stanley were sitting next each other, and, addressing the latter in the hearing of the former, I said, 'Has our noble and learned friend told you the disappointment he suffered this morning? He thought he had a visit from the leader of the Protectionists to offer him the Great Seal, and it turned out to be only Campbell come to bore him about a point of Scotch law.' Brougham: 'Don't mind what Jack Campbell says; he has a prescriptive privilege to tell lies of all Chancellors dead and living.' Many jokes were circulated against Brougham on this occasion. A few days after his great speech, I myself heard Lyndhurst say to him, 'Brougham, here is a riddle for you. Why does Lord Brougham know so much about the Navigation Laws? Answer: Because he has been so long engaged in the Seal fishery.'"

Smelling Bottle for a Parliamentary Antagonist.—Charles Williams Wynn, for many years the father of the House of Commons, who from his youth upwards had been the great oracle of Parliamentary law, delivered an opinion in the House, on a question of privilege, contrary to Brougham's, fortifying his position with many precedents and references to the Journals. Lord Campbell, relates the incident, and the compliment Brougham paid to the learned member, winding up with the statement that "In short, he

is a man whose devotion in this respect can only be equalled by that of a learned ancestor of his (Speaker Williams, *temp. Car. II.*), who having fainted from excessive toil and fatigue, a smelling-bottle was called for, when one, who knew much better the remedy adapted to the case, exclaimed, 'For God's sake bring him an old black-letter Act of Parliament, and let him smell that!' I cannot help thinking that, in like manner, if my right honourable and learned friend should ever be attacked in a similar way, the mere smelling of a volume of the Journals could not fail instantly to revive him."

LORD BROUGHTON.

"A Trifling Mistake."—Mr. John Cam Hobhouse (afterwards Lord Broughton), the friend and fellow-traveller of Byron, to whom was dedicated the Fourth Canto of "Childe Harold," incurred, in 1819, the high displeasure of the House of Commons, under the following circumstances, as gathered from "Hansard":—On December the 10th, Mr. Courtenay rose to complain of a pamphlet which had been published, entitled "A Trifling Mistake in Thomas Lord Erskine's recent Preface shortly noticed, and respectfully corrected, in a Letter to his Lordship, by the author of 'The Defence of the People.'" The following extract, amongst others, was read from the pamphlet:—"What prevents the people from walking down to the House and pulling out the members by the ears, locking up their doors, and flinging the key into the Thames?" On a subsequent day the publisher of the *brochure* having been summoned to the bar, and the name of the writer divulged, it was moved and carried "That John Cam Hobhouse, Esq., be, for his said offence, committed to his Majesty's gaol of Newgate." The offender remained in confinement till the death of George III., in the following January, occasioned a dissolution of Parliament. Shortly

after this, Mr. Hobhouse took his seat in the assembly he had denounced in such strong language, as one of the members for Westminster, and delivered his maiden speech May 9th, 1820. The occasion was on Mr. Alderman Wood's motion respecting the criminal conduct and proceedings of George Edwards, said to have been connected with the Cato Street Conspiracy. In the course of his address he referred to his own case in these terms:—"Now let me recall to the honourable member for Corfe Castle the dreadful alarms, the prompt proceedings adopted against the author of a pamphlet in which it seemed possible that some recommendations to a dispersion of this House might be found. Here was no plot, no grenades, no mischief either done or meditated; but though this Edwards is to walk at large, the author of a single passage of disputable meaning is to be sent to prison without trial and without citation."

His Majesty's Opposition.—It was Mr. Hobhouse who first spoke of "His Majesty's Opposition." Canning accepted the appellation as appropriate. A distinguished member of the Opposition gave it the stamp of his approval, while, adding a pithy exposition of its meaning. Tierney said, "No better phrase could be adopted; for we are certainly a branch of his Majesty's Government. Although the gentlemen opposite are in office, we are in power. The measures are ours, but all the emoluments are theirs."—*Edinburgh Review.*

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT.

A Favourite.—"Burdett," said Byron, "is sweet and silvery as Belial himself, and, I think, the greatest favourite in Pandemonium; at least, I always heard the country gentlemen and the ministerial devilry praise his speeches *up*stairs, and run down from Bellamy's when he was upon his legs."—*Moore's "Life."*

Burdett's Committal to the Tower.—J. Gale Jones, the president of a debating club, published some resolutions of his society on the debate which arose (1810) relative to the expedition to the Scheldt. For this he was summoned to the bar of the House, and committed to Newgate. Sir Francis Burdett took up his cause, and denied the power of the Commons to commit to prison any but their own members; and repeated his arguments in a letter published in *Cobbett's Weekly Register*. This being brought before the House, he was committed to the Tower. Cooke, in his "History of Party," thus describes the circumstances attending the execution of the order:—"Crowds surrounded the house of Sir Francis, who affected to resist the warrant by force, and barricaded his doors. Twenty police officers, assisted by detachments of cavalry and infantry, were necessary to execute the warrant. Burdett still resisted; and, lest the theatrical display should be incomplete, the constables, when they broke into the house, found him teaching his infant son to read and translate Magna Charta. As he was borne along to the Tower, the crowds assembled attacked the soldiery; pistol-shots were fired on each side, and the troops did not return from their ungrateful duty without a sanguinary conflict, in which several people were slain. A more useless or unnecessary provocation of a scene of carnage does not occur in our history. Sir Francis brought an action against the Speaker, and, being defeated, thus had the merit of formally establishing the important principle of the Constitution which he had attacked."

Hoisting Canning with his own Petard.—It was in one of those debates of the pre-Reform period that Canning, in the course of an elaborate defence of the borough system, urged that it formed an essential element of the British Constitution, since it had

"Grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength."

Sir Francis Burdett took up the quotation in reply, and said, "The right honourable gentleman doubtless remembers the first line of the distich he has cited, and that it is

> 'The young disease, which must subdue at length,
> Grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength.'"

Canning acknowledged that the retort was a happy and a just one.—*Edinburgh Review.*

Burdett a High Tory.—Sir Francis Burdett, reverting to the notion that the prerogative of the Crown in choosing its servants ought to be unfettered and uncontrolled, said, in bringing forward a motion for reform of Parliament, "If a country gentleman were to offer to a servant out of place to make him his butler, and the man were to answer, 'I will not be your butler unless you will take Harry for your coachman, and Thomas for your groom, and Dick for your footman,' the gentleman would be greatly astonished." This remark proves that Sir Francis Burdett was, as he sometimes avowed himself to be, a high prerogative Tory of the days of Queen Anne.—*Earl Russell's Introduction to "Speeches."*

His Duel with Mr. Paull.—The following particulars of the duel which took place between Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Paull are taken from the account of the occurrence published in the *Annual Register.* "Mr. Paull, who was a candidate for the representation of Westminster in 1807, had advertised a meeting of his friends to dine at the Crown and Anchor, in the Strand, the chair to be occupied by Sir Francis Burdett. A correspondence ensued upon this announcement, opening with a communication from Sir Francis, in which he disavowed any knowledge of the proposed gathering, and asserted that he had not sanctioned the use of his name in connection with it. The dispute between the two gentlemen, increasing in acrimony, finally culminated in a challenge being forwarded by Mr. Paull

to Sir Francis Burdett. The parties met, attended by their seconds, at Combe Wood, near Wimbledon Common, on the 5th of May. They discharged two pistols each; the second shot fired by Mr. Paull wounded Sir Francis in the thigh; the second pistol fired by Sir Francis wounded Mr. Paull in the leg. This terminating the business, they both returned from Wimbledon in Mr. Paull's carriage."

EDMUND BURKE.

Burke in the Strangers' Gallery.—One giant attraction would draw the youthful genius from his desk, his journeys, and even from the intellectual tables of his friends. It was Burke's frequent and favourite custom to go alone to the House of Commons; to there ensconce himself in the gallery, and to sit for hours, his attention absorbed, and his mind enrapt in the scene beneath him. "Some of these men," he remarked to a friend, "talk like Demosthenes or Cicero; and I feel when I am listening to them as if I were in Athens or Rome." Soon these nightly visits became his passion; a strange fascination drew him again and again to the same place. No doubt the magic of his own master spirit was upon him, and the spell was working. He might be compared to the young eagle accustoming its eye to the sun before it soared aloft.—*Burke's "Life of Burke."*

His First Speech.—In January, 1766, Mr. Burke seized the first opportunity of taking an active part in the discussion concerning America. Mr. Pitt immediately followed Mr. Burke in the debate, and complimented him by observing that "the young member had proved himself a very able advocate. He had himself intended to enter at length into the details, but he had been anticipated with so much ingenuity and eloquence that there was little left for him to say. He congratulated him on his success, and his friends on the value of the acquisition they had made."

On his quitting the House, all his friends crowded round him, expressing the greatest pleasure at the result, the praise of Mr. Pitt being of itself, in the general opinion, a passport to fame.—*Prior's "Life."*

A Bull.—In the course of his speech during the debate on the budget (1772), Burke said, "The minister comes down in state, attended by his creatures of all denominations—beasts clean and unclean. With such, however, as they are, he comes down, opens his budget, and edifies us all with his speech. What is the consequence? One half of the House goes away. A gentleman on the other side gets up, and harangues upon the state of the nation; and, in order to keep matters even, another half retires at the close of his speech. A third gentleman follows their example, and rids the House of another half (a loud laugh through the House). Sir (said he, turning the laugh with some address and humour), I take the blunder to myself, and confess my satisfaction at having said anything that can put the House in good humour."—*Ibid.*

A False Quantity.—Mr. Burke, in the course of some very severe animadversions which he made on Lord North, for want of due economy in his management of the public purse, introduced the well-known aphorism, *Magnum vectigal est parsimonia*, but was guilty of a false quantity by saying *vectĭgal*. Lord North, while this philippic went on, had been half asleep, and sat heaving backwards and forwards like a great turtle; but the sound of a false quantity instantly aroused him, and opening his eyes he exclaimed, in a very marked and distinct manner, "*Vectīgal*." "I thank the noble lord," said Burke, with happy adroitness, "for the correction, the more particularly as it affords me the opportunity of repeating a maxim which he greatly needs to have reiterated upon him." He then thundered out, "*Magnum vectīgal est parsimonia.*"—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

Optimism.—When a message from the King was read

in the House of Commons, April 15th, 1782, recommending economy in the public expenditure, Burke rose to speak, and characterised the royal message as "the best of messages to the best of people from the best of kings."—*Parliamentary History.*

The "Oftener-if-need-be's."—Burke opposed a motion by Mr. Flood for parliamentary reform, which produced a very candid confession from Mr. Fox, that though *he* thought such a measure advisable, the country at large did not seem to be of the same opinion. A jest of Burke on this question, widely disseminated in private society, threw much ridicule upon the enthusiasts in this cause. A new party of Reformers, he said, had arisen still more pure in their creed than the rest, who deemed annual parliaments not sufficiently frequent, and quoted in support of their doctrine the latter words of the statute of Edward III., that "a parliament shall be holden every year once, and *more often if need be.*" How to designate these gentlemen from their less orthodox associates he knew not, except, indeed, their tenets furnished the hint, and they be known as the *Oftener-if-need-be's.—Prior's "Life."*

The Bright Particular Star.—In the session 1780-1, speaking on Irish affairs, Burke thus referred to the state of Ireland:—"So many and such great revolutions had happened of late, that he was not much surprised to hear the right honourable gentleman (Mr. Jenkinson) treat the loss of the supremacy of this country over Ireland as a matter of very little consequence. Thus one star, and that the brightest ornament of our orrery, having been supposed to be lost, those who were accustomed to watch and inspect our political heaven ought not to wonder that it should be followed by the loss of another.

> 'So star would follow star, and light light,
> Till all was darkness and eternal night.'"
>
> —*Parliamentary History.*

The Spiritual Peers.—A phrase that has often been used in reference to the presence of the bishops in the House of Lords is to be found in Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution":—"We have not," he says, "relegated religion to obscure municipalities or rustic villages. No! We will have her to exalt her mitred front in Courts and Parliaments."

Salutary Neglect.—Several of Burke's most famous sayings occurred in his speech in favour of conciliation with America, in the House of Commons on the 22nd of March, 1775. For example, with reference to the rapid growth of the American colonies, he remarked:—"No sea but what is vexed by their fisheries; no climate that is not witness to their toils. Neither the perseverance of Holland, nor the activity of France, nor the dexterous and firm sagacity of English enterprise, ever carried this most perilous mode of hard industry to the extent to which it has been pushed by this recent people—a people who are still, as it were, but in their gristle, and not yet hardened into the bone of manhood. When I contemplate these things; when I know that the colonies in general owe little or nothing to any care of ours, and that they are not squeezed into this happy form by the constraint of watchful and suspicious government, but that, through a wise and salutary neglect, a generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection; when I reflect upon these effects, when I see how profitable they have been to us, I feel all the pride of power sink, and all presumption in the wisdom of human contrivances melt and die away within me. My rigour relents; I pardon something to the spirit of liberty."

Compromise.—It was in the speech just referred to that Mr. Burke also remarked:—"We Englishmen stop very short of the principles upon which we support any given part of our constitution, or even the whole of it together. * * This

is nothing but what is natural and proper. All government —indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, and every prudent act—is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences; we give and take; we remit some rights that we may enjoy others; and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants. As we must give away some natural liberty to enjoy civil advantages, so we must sacrifice some civil liberties for the advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire."

A Fortunate Precaution.—On the 6th of February, 1778, Burke made a speech of nearly three hours and a half, in moving for papers relating to the military employment of Indians on the continent of America. His speech seems to have been one of wonderful eloquence. Walpole says, "His wit made North, Rigby, and ministers laugh; his pathos drew tears down Barré's cheeks." The *Annual Register* tells us that while one member wished to have the speech posted on the church doors, "a member of great distinction (Governor Johnstone) congratulated the ministers upon admitting no strangers on that day into the gallery, as the indignation of the people might have been excited against them to a degree that would have endangered their safety."—*Earl Russell's "Life of Fox."*

Biding his Time.—Directly after the return of Warren Hastings from India, Burke gave notice in the House of Commons that he would make a motion respecting his conduct. Nothing further transpired in the matter for some months, until at last Major Scott, a friend of Hastings, called upon Burke in the House to produce his charges. "Mr. Burke's haughty reply to the major was the relation of the anecdote of the great Duke of Parma, who, being challenged by Henry IV. of France to bring his forces into open field, and instantly decide their disputes, answered, with a smile, 'that he knew very well what he had to do,

and was not come so far to be directed by an enemy.'"—*Burke's "Life of Burke."*

Burke and Warren Hastings.—There was one man who had watched Hastings' conduct, and for five years had made it his peculiar study. He rose from that study convinced that Mr. Hastings had overstepped all the limits of conventional law, and broken the bonds of primitive morality. That man was Mr. Burke. He justified his animosity by alleging the patience and perseverance of his inquiries. He was not actuated, he said, by ignorance, inadvertency, or passion. "Anger, indeed, he had felt, but surely not a blamable anger; for who ever heard of a digesting anger, a collating anger, an examining anger, a deliberating anger, a selecting anger?" Yet this plea is not quite conclusive; Mr. Burke kindled his anger by the perusal of bulky documents, and heaped up the fuel of his indignation by poring over a vast mass of despatches.—*Earl Russell's "Life of Fox."*

The Grasshopper.—Sir Philip Francis once waited upon Burke by appointment, to read over to him some papers respecting Mr. Hastings' delinquencies. He called on Burke on his way to the house of a friend with whom he was engaged to dine. He found him in his garden, holding a grasshopper. "What a beautiful animal is this!" said Burke. "Observe its structure—its legs, its wings, its eyes." "How can you," said Sir Philip, "lose your time in admiring such an animal, when you have so many objects of moment to attend to?" "Yet Socrates," said Burke, "according to the exhibition of him in Aristophanes, attended to a much less animal; he actually measured the proportion which its size bore to the space it passed over in a skip. I think the skip of a grasshopper does not exceed its length. Let us see." "My dear friend," said Sir Philip, "I am in a great hurry; let us walk in, and let me read my papers to you." Into the house they walked. Sir Philip began to read, and

Burke appeared to listen. At length, Sir Philip having mislaid a paper, a pause ensued. "I think," said Burke, "that naturalists are now agreed that *locusta*, not *ciccda*, is the Latin word for grasshopper. What's your opinion, Sir Philip?" "My opinion," answered Sir Philip, packing up his papers and preparing to move off, "is that till the grasshopper is out of your head it will be idle to talk to you of the concerns of India."—*Butler's "Reminiscences."*

A Nightcap Wanted.—During one of the debates on Lord Pigott's recall from Madras, he had twice given way to other speakers, when, observing the chairman of the India Company proceeding to read a variety of well-known public papers, instead of adducing any new arguments, he interrupted him by observing, "That if it were the object of the honourable member to tire and thin the House by reading all the heavy folios on the table, he supposed in courtesy he must submit; but to prepare for the task he begged leave to send for his nightcap;" which producing general laughter, was followed by a shout to him of "Go on! go on!"—*Prior's "Life."*

The Lion Discomfited.—In a new Parliament which met in May, 1784, Burke was not viewed with much favour by many of the members. A prejudice or combination, chiefly of the younger members of the House, was formed so strong against him, that the moment of his rising became a signal for coughing or other symptoms of pointed dislike, by men who had no chance of success against him in any other manner. On one occasion, instead of threatening, like Mr. Tierney when similarly assailed, to "speak for three hours longer," he stopped short in his argument to remark that "he could teach a pack of hounds to yelp with more melody and equal comprehension." At another time, having occasion to rise with papers in his hand, a rough country gentleman, who had more ear, perhaps, for this melody of the hounds than for political

discussion, exclaimed, with something of a look of despair, "I hope the honourable gentleman does not mean to read that large bundle of papers and bore us with a long speech into the bargain." Mr. Burke is said to have felt so much irritation that, incapable of utterance for some minutes, he ran out of the House. "Never before," said the facetious George Selwyn, who told the story with great effect, "did I see the fable realised—a lion put to flight by the braying of an ass."—*Ibid.*

Burke and Wedderburne.—On December 3rd, 1777, an incident occurred in Burke's parliamentary life of which we have no other instance. "There were high words," writes Mr. Crawford to Lord Ossory, "between Wedderburne and Burke, which so offended the latter that he went out of the House, and I believe intended to challenge Wedderburne, but was prevented by a letter from Wedderburne, and an explanation likewise, which he sent through Charles" (Fox). He had, it appears, laughed at a part of Wedderburne's speech when dead silence reigned in the House, so that it was heard; this produced irritation, followed by what he understood to be either rudeness or a personal threat; and thence the misunderstanding, which, however, was soon forgotten by both.—*Ibid.*

Two in One.—On the day when the celebrated junction between the parties of Mr. Fox and Lord North was declared, Mr. Burke and Colonel North entered the House of Commons together, just as the Speaker was beginning to count the House, and as he pointed to them, and in the customary manner called out "One, two——" Mr. Burke interrupted him with, "Pardon me, sir; we were two yesterday, but are only one to-day."—*Life of Lord Sidmouth.*

The Rupture between Burke and Fox.—The progress of the Canada Bill (1791) was fraught with an interest far beyond its own. It was made memorable by a collateral incident which it produced—by the utter breach and lasting

estrangement of the two great leaders of the Opposition. In arguing against the Canada Bill, Fox had not scrupled to draw some illustrations from the recent changes in France; nor had he forborne from some reflections—or what seemed so—on the recent writings of Burke. A debate on a different subject had given Fox another opportunity for going over the same ground. On this second occasion Burke, who was not present on the first, had risen with signs of strong emotion; but the hour being late, and the House exhausted, he was stopped by loud cries of "Question!" chiefly from the friends of Fox. At a later period Fox is known to have regretted the injudicious zeal of those who would not allow Burke to answer his remarks upon the spot. "The contention," he said, "might have been fiercer and hotter, but the remembrance of it would not have settled so deep and rankled so long." * * * On the 6th of May the expectation of the House was wound up to the highest pitch. But by that time the friends of Fox had discovered that it was highly irregular and blamable to foist reflections upon France into debates upon Canada. This irregularity, which had not struck them while the practice was continued by Fox, appeared to them in the strongest light the moment a reply was announced by Burke. When, therefore, on the 6th of May, Burke rose in his place, and was proceeding with solemn earnestness to inveigh against the evil and the error of the French Revolution, there appeared a fixed design to interrupt him. Member after member from his own side started up to call him to order. * * * A tumultuous scène ensued. There was, as Burke said, a most disorderly rage for order. When at last he was suffered in some measure to proceed, chafed and goaded as he had been, and even at length by Fox among the rest, he no doubt spoke against "the right honourable gentleman" (for now he dropped the name of friend) much more bitterly and strongly than he had at first designed. "Certainly," he

said, "it is indiscreet at any period, but especially at my time of life, to provoke enemies, or to give my friends occasion to desert me. Yet, if my firm and steady adherence to the British Constitution place me in such a dilemma, I am ready to risk all, and with my last words to exclaim, 'Fly from the French Constitution!' Fox here whispered across to him that there was no loss of friends. "Yes," rejoined Burke; "yes, there is a loss of friends. I know the price of my conduct. I have done my duty at the price of my friend. Our friendship is at an end!" * * * And thus ended a friendship of twenty-five years.—*Stanhope's "Life of Pitt."*

Entertaining his Friends.—While in town, he frequently asked political and literary friends to dine or sup as it happened on beefsteaks or a leg of mutton, and commonly gave no more than his invitation professed. Of this an instance is related, which as an after dinner story tells amusingly. Having been detained late in the House, he asked Fox, Lord John Cavendish, and two or three more of the party to sup, when, on announcing the object of their visit to Mrs. Burke, a look of annoyance and despair sufficiently told the ill-provided state of the larder. A pause ensued. "Surely," said the host, with a comic face, "there is beef enough!" Fox and two or three others, making an apology for momentary absence, hurried off to a neighbouring tavern, provided themselves each with a dish of such fare as could be procured, and, amid much laughter from all parties, particularly the master of the house, who cracked some jokes on their skill as waiters, passed an amusing evening. —*Prior's "Life."*

Making Election Sure.—An instance of his promptitude to seize any incident that offered to aid or illustrate his aim at the moment, was told frequently by the eminent dissenting divine, Robert Hall, as having come under his own knowledge. While canvassing Bristol, Burke and his friends

entered a house where the wife of the owner was reading her Bible. "I have called, madam, to solicit the favour of your husband's vote and interest in the present election. You, I perceive," placing his finger on a passage that caught his eye, "are 'making your calling and election sure.'"—*Ibid.*

"Ditto to Mr. Burke."—When Burke, on his election for Bristol in 1774, had returned thanks to his constituents in an eloquent speech from the hustings, "a humorous incident terminated the day's triumph. Mr. Cruger, Burke's colleague, a worthy merchant in the American trade, and a citizen of Bristol, but no orator, was dumbfounded by the eloquence of his mighty coadjutor. When his own turn came to thank the electors, he had recourse to a speech which, though savouring of his counting-house, was under the circumstances about the best he could make. He cried out, 'Gentlemen, I say ditto to Mr. Burke! ditto to Mr. Burke!' A roar of laughter and applause marked the approval of his audience."—*Burke's "Life of Burke."*

The Day of No Judgment.—Dining with Mr. Pitt at Downing Street one day in 1791, Mr. Burke strove to alarm Mr. Pitt on the aggressive nature of French principles, and the propagandism of revolution. Mr. Pitt made rather light of the danger, and said, in colloquial phrase, "This country and constitution were safe to the day of judgment." "Yes," Mr. Burke quickly retorted, "but 'tis the day of *no* judgment that I am afraid of."—*Prior.*

The Dagger Scene.—It was on the second reading of the Aliens Bill, the 28th of December, 1792, that Mr. Burke enacted the celebrated dagger scene. The following are the words in which Lord Sidmouth ("Life and Correspondence") used to relate this anecdote to his friends:—"When Burke, after only a few preliminary remarks, the House being totally unprepared, fumbled in his bosom, and suddenly drew out the dagger and threw it on the floor, his extravagant gesture excited a general disposition to titter,

by which most men would have been disconcerted; but he, observing he had failed of making the intended impression, immediately collected himself for an effort, and by a few brilliant sentences recalled the seriousness of the House. 'Let us,' said he, 'keep French principles from our heads, and French daggers from our hearts; let us preserve all our blandishments in life, and all our consolations in death, all the blessings of time, and all the hopes of eternity.'" It appears from a statement by the Earl of Eldon in his grandfather's "Life" that the dagger had been sent from France to a manufacturer at Birmingham, with an order for a large number to be made like it, and that Mr. Burke had only received it that same day from Sir James Bland Burgess, on his way down to the House.

Good Speeches never without Effect.—It is extremely discouraging to be constantly out-voted, when possibly not out-argued; to spend time, labour, and ingenuity, "to watch, fast, and sweat night after night," as Burke himself forcibly expresses it, and not emerge from the slough of constant minorities. No person felt this more than Burke; yet none has more ably stated the necessity and even advantages resulting to the country and to the members so situated from a well-directed opposition, than he has done in a conversation with Sir Joshua Reynolds. "Mr. Burke," said the painter, "I do not mean to flatter; but when posterity reads one of your speeches in Parliament, it will be difficult to believe that you took so much pains, knowing with certainty that it could produce no effect; that not one vote would be gained by it." "Waiving your compliment to me," replied the orator, "I shall say in general that it is very well worth while for a man to take pains to speak well in Parliament. A man who has vanity speaks to display his talents; and if a man speaks well, he gradually establishes a certain reputation and consequence in the general opinion, which sooner or later will have its political reward.

Besides, though not one vote is gained, a good speech has its effect. Though an Act of Parliament which has been ably opposed passes into a law, yet in its progress it is modelled and softened in such a manner, that we see plainly the minister has been told that the members attached to him are so sensible of its injustice or absurdity from what they have heard, that it must be altered."—*Prior.*

LORD BUTE.

A Minute Gun Speech.—Lord Bute delivered a speech in favour of the Cider Bill in the House of Lords, on the 28th March, 1763, in reply to Lord Hardwicke, who opposed the measure. His delivery on this occasion was so particularly slow and solemn that Charles Townshend, standing on the steps of the throne, called out, in an audible whisper, "Minute guns!" "These," says Lord Campbell in his "Lives of the Chancellors," "might be considered as announcing the funeral of Lord Bute's Ministry."

An Unpopular Minister.—The First Lord of the Treasury was detested by many as a Tory, by many as a favourite, and by many as a Scot. * * * He could hardly walk the streets in safety without disguising himself. A gentleman who died not many years ago used to say that he once recognised the favourite earl in the piazza of Covent Garden, muffled in a large coat, and with a hat and wig drawn down over his brows. His lordship's established type with the mob was a jackboot—a wretched pun on his Christian name and title. A jackboot, generally accompanied by a petticoat, was sometimes fastened on a gallows, and sometimes committed to the flames.—*Macaulay's Essay on Chatham.*

SIR T. F. BUXTON.

What Weapons may be Used.—In the spring of 1818 a dissolution of Parliament took place, and Mr. Buxton

offered himself as a candidate for Weymouth. * * * Very frequently the voters were anxious to decide the matter as Irish counsel used to decide their causes—by fighting it out." Mr. Buxton was obliged to entreat his friends to use moderation towards their opponents. "Beat them," said he, "beat them in the generous exercise of high principle; beat them in disdain of corruption, and the display of pure integrity; but do not beat them with bludgeons."—*"Memoirs," by his Son.*

A Wonderful Debate.—Sir T. F. Buxton, writing to his brother-in-law, Mr. Gurney, November 25th, 1819, thus refers to the debate on the Manchester Riots:—"We have had a wonderful debate; really it has raised my idea of the capacity and ingenuity of the human mind. All the leaders spoke, and almost all outdid themselves. But Burdett stands first; his speech was absolutely the finest, and the clearest and the fairest display of masterly understanding, that ever I heard; and, with shame I ought to confess it, he did not utter a sentence to which I could not agree. Canning was second; if there be any difference between eloquence and sense, this was the difference between him and Burdett. He was exquisitely elegant, and kept the tide of reason and argument, irony, joke, invective, and declamation, flowing for nearly three hours. Plunket was third; he took hold of poor Mackintosh's argument, and griped it to death; ingenious, subtle, yet clear and bold, and putting with the most logical distinctness to the House the errors of his antagonist. Next came Brougham—and what do you think of a debate in which the fourth man could keep alive the attention of the House from three to five in the morning, after a twelve hours' debate?"—*Ibid.*

LORD BYRON.

Byron's First Speech.—He made his first speech in the House of Lords in February, 1812, on the Nottingham

Frame-breaking Bill. He was then twenty-four years of age. In a letter addressed to a friend soon afterwards he writes:—"Lords Holland and Grenville, particularly the latter, paid me some high compliments in the course of their speeches, as you may have seen in the papers, and Lords Eldon and Harrowby answered me. I have had many marvellous eulogies repeated to me since, in person and by proxy, from divers persons ministerial—yea, ministerial!—as well as oppositionists; of them I shall only mention Sir F. Burdett. He says it is the best speech by a *lord* since the 'Lord knows when,' probably from a fellow-feeling in the sentiments. Lord H. tells me I shall beat them all if I persevere; and Lord G. remarked that the construction of some of my periods are very like Burke's!! And so much for vanity. I spoke very violent sentences with a sort of modest impudence, abused everything and everybody, and put the Lord Chancellor very much out of humour; and, if I may believe what I hear, have not lost any character by the experiment. As to my delivery, loud and fluent enough, perhaps a little theatrical. I could not recognise myself or any one else in the newspapers."

A Forgotten Grievance.—Byron's second display, says Moore, was less promising than his first. "His delivery was thought mouthing and theatrical, being infected, I take for granted (having never heard him speak in Parliament), with the same chanting tone that disfigured his recitation of poetry." In the following year he made his third and last appearance as an orator in the Lords. "In his way home," writes Moore again, "he called at my lodgings. He was, I recollect, in a state of most humorous exaltation after his display, and spouted forth, in a sort of mock heroic voice, detached sentences of the speech he had just been delivering. 'I told them,' he said, 'that it was a most flagrant violation of the constitution—that, if such things were permitted, there was an end

of English freedom.' 'But what was this dreadful grievance?' I asked, interrupting him in his eloquence. 'The grievance?' he repeated, pausing, as if to consider. 'Oh *that*' I forget.'"

Prose *versus* Poetry.—Reviewing his own parliamentary appearances, Byron thus wrote:—"Sheridan told me he was sure I should make an orator, if I would but take to speaking, and grow a Parliament man. He never ceased harping upon this to me to the last; and I remember my old tutor, Dr. Drury, had the same notion when I was a boy; but it never was my turn of inclination to try. I spoke once or twice, as all young peers do, as a kind of introduction into public life; but dissipation, shyness, haughty and reserved opinions, together with the short time I lived in England after my majority (only about five years in all), prevented me from resuming the experiment. As far as it went, it was not discouraging, particularly my first speech (I spoke three or four times in all); but just after it my poem of 'Childe Harold' was published, and nobody ever thought about my *prose* afterwards, nor indeed did I; it became to me a secondary and neglected object, though I sometimes wonder to myself if I should have succeeded."

Parliamentary Impressions.—"I never," said Byron, "heard the speech that was not too long for the auditors, and not very intelligible, except here and there. The whole thing is a grand deception, and as tedious and tiresome as may be to those who must be often present. * * * The impression of Parliament upon me was that its members are not formidable as speakers, but very much so as an audience; because in so numerous a body there may be little eloquence (after all, there were but two thorough orators in all antiquity, and, I suspect, still fewer in modern times), but there must be a leaven of thought and good sense sufficient to make them *know* what is right, though they can't express it nobly. Horne Tooke and Roscoe both are said to have declared that

they left Parliament with a higher opinion of its aggregate integrity and abilities than that with which they entered it. The general amount of both in most Parliaments is probably about the same, as also the number of *speakers* and their talent. I except *orators*, of course, because they are things of ages, and not of septennial or triennial reunions. Neither House ever struck me with more awe or respect than the same number of Turks in a divan, or of Methodists in a barn, would have done."—*Moore's "Life of Byron."*

EARL CAMDEN.

A Friend of Freedom.—When the Libel Act was under discussion in the House of Lords, in 1792, the Chancellor (Thurlow), as the last effort to retain the law in judicial hands, asked if Lord Camden would object to a clause being inserted granting a new trial, in case the court were dissatisfied with a verdict for the defendant. "What!" exclaimed the veteran friend of freedom; "after a verdict of acquittal?" "Yes," said Lord Thurlow. "No, I thank you," was the memorable reply, and the last words spoken in public by this great man. The bill immediately was passed.—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

"Unwhig."—Lord Camden, writing to the Duke of Grafton (August 1st, 1782) respecting his intention of resigning the Privy Seal, said: "Considering the perilous condition of the public at this conjuncture, I should be much concerned if your grace was to take a hasty resolution of retiring just now, because your retreat would certainly be followed by other resignations, and would totally 'unwhig' the administration, if I may use the expression." The only other occasion I recollect of this word being used was when Mr. Fox, on the King's illness, having contended that the heir-apparent was entitled as of right to be Regent, Mr. Pitt said, "For this doctine I will *unwhig* him for the rest of his days."—*Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors."*

GEORGE CANNING.

His Maiden Speech.—It was on the 31st of January, 1794, in his second session, that he made his first speech, in favour of a subsidy proposed to be granted to the King of Sardinia. In a letter dated March 20th, 1794, addressed to Lord Boringdon, he thus expresses himself respecting the great event:—"I intended to have told you, at full length, what were my feelings at getting up and being pointed at by the Speaker, and hearing my name called from all sides of the House; how I trembled lest I should hesitate, or misplace a word in the first two or three sentences; while all was dead silence around me, and my own voice sounded to my ears quite like some other gentleman's; how, in about ten minutes or less, I got warmed in collision with Fox's arguments, and did not even care twopence for anybody or anything; how I was roused, in about half an hour, from this pleasing state of self-sufficiency by accidentally casting my eyes towards the Opposition bench, for the purpose of paying compliments to Fox, and assuring him of my respect and admiration, and there seeing certain members of Opposition laughing (as I thought) and quizzing me; how the accident abashed me, and, together with my being out of breath, rendered me incapable of uttering; how those who sat below me on the Treasury bench, seeing what it was that distressed me, cheered loudly, and the House joined them; and how, in less than a minute, straining every nerve in my body, and plucking up every bit of resolution in my heart, I went on more boldly than ever, and getting into a part of my subject that I liked, and having the House with me, got happily and triumphantly to the end."—*Stapleton's "Canning and his Times."* "This first speech," says Sir H. Bulwer, "like many other first speeches of men who have become eminent orators, was more or less a failure. The subject was a

subsidy to Sardinia, and the new member began with a scoff at the idea of looking with a mere mercantile eye at the goodness or badness of the bargain we were making. Such a scoff, uttered in an assembly which is the especial guardian of the public purse, was injudicious; but the whole speech was bad. It possessed in an eminent degree all the ordinary faults of the declamation of clever young men. Its arguments were much too refined; its arrangement much too systematic; cold, tedious, and unparliamentary, it would have been twice as good if it had attempted half as much; for the great art in speaking, as in writing, consists in knowing what should not be said or written."—*Historical Characters.*

Men, not Measures!—In a speech in 1801, in opposition to the Addington ministry, Mr. Canning said, "Away with the cant of 'Measures, not men!'—the idle supposition that it is the harness and not the horses that draw the chariot along. No, sir; if the comparison must be made, if the distinction must be taken, men are everything, measures are comparatively nothing. I speak of times of difficulty and danger, when systems are shaken, when precedents and general rules of conduct fail; then it is that not to that or to this measure—however prudently devised, however blameless in execution—but to the energy and character of individuals, a State must be indebted for its salvation."—*Hansard.*

Subsidence of the Deluge.—In supporting the vote of thanks in the House of Commons, July 17th, 1813, to the Marquis of Wellington, for the victory gained at the battle of Vittoria, Mr. Canning said, "How was their prospect changed! In those countries where, at most, a short struggle had been terminated by a result disastrous to their wishes, if not altogether closing in despair, they had now to contemplate a very different aspect of affairs. Germany crouched no longer trembling at the feet of the tyrant, but

maintained a balanced contest. The mighty deluge by which the Continent had been overwhelmed began to subside. The limits of nations were again visible, and the spires and turrets of ancient establishments began to reappear. It was this victory which had defined these objects, so lately involved in overwhelming confusion."—*Ibid.*

Canning on Reform.—Sir Robert Peel, in reply to a Repeal speech by O'Connell, in 1834, ridiculed the proposal by the exclamation, "Repeal the Union! As well restore the Heptarchy!" Canning, however, had used it some years before, in a speech against parliamentary reform, which he treated as preposterous, saying, "Reform the Parliament! Repeal the Union! Restore the Heptarchy!"

Taking Observations.—"Sir Robert Peel, his distinguished rival, told me one day," says Sir H. L. Bulwer, "in speaking of Mr. Canning, that he would often, before rising in his place, make a sort of lounging tour of the House, listening to the tone of the observations which the previous debate had excited, so that at last, when he himself spoke, he seemed to a large part of his audience to be merely giving a striking form to their own thoughts."—*Historical Characters.*

Tickling the Victims.—Thomas Moore, in his "Dream of a Turtle," thus humorously hits off some of the characteristics of Canning:—

"And on that turtle I saw a rider,
A goodly man, with an eye so merry,
I knew 'twas our Foreign Secretary,
Who there at his ease did sit and smile
Like Waterton on his crocodile;
Cracking such jokes at every motion,
As made the turtle squeak with glee,
And own that they gave him a lively notion
Of what his own forced-meat balls would be."

Peace and War.—One of the most finished and effective of Canning's oratorical displays was a speech delivered at

Plymouth in 1823, in which the following celebrated passage occurred:—"While we control even our feelings by our duty, let it not be said that we cultivate peace either because we fear or because we are unprepared for war; on the contrary, if eight months ago the Government did not hesitate to proclaim that the country was prepared for war, if war should be unfortunately necessary, every month of peace that has since passed has but made us so much the more capable of exertion. The resources created by peace are means of war. In cherishing those resources, we but accumulate those means. Our present repose is no more a proof of inability to act, than the state of inertness and inactivity in which I have seen those mighty masses that float in the waters above your town, is a proof that they are devoid of strength and incapable of being fitted out for action. You well know, gentlemen, how soon one of those stupendous masses now reposing on their shadows in perfect stillness—how soon, upon any call of patriotism or of necessity, it would assume the likeness of an animated thing, instinct with life and motion—how soon it would ruffle, as it were, its swelling plumage—how quickly would it put forth all its beauty and its bravery, collect its scattered elements of strength, and awaken its dormant thunder. Such as is one of these magnificent machines when springing from inaction into a display of its might—such is England herself, while apparently passive and motionless she silently concentrates the power to be put forth on an adequate occasion. But God forbid that that occasion should arise. After a war sustained for nearly a quarter of a century—sometimes single-handed, and with all Europe arrayed at times against her or at her side—England needs a period of tranquillity, and may enjoy it without fear of misconstruction."

Ministerial Promptitude.—A Magniloquent Boast.—On the 12th of December, 1826, Canning, then Foreign Minister, made a masterly speech on the relations between

Great Britain and Portugal. Mr. Brougham, who rose afterwards, said the Secretary's eloquence had been inspired "with a degree of fervour, energy, and effect extraordinary and unprecedented in this House." In the course of his speech, Mr. Canning gave an instance of ministerial promptitude which has often been cited in reproof of more dilatory Cabinets. He said, "The precise information on which we could act only arrived on Friday last; on Saturday the decision of the Government was taken; on Sunday we obtained the sanction of his Majesty; on Monday we came down to Parliament; and at this very hour, while I have now the honour of addressing the House, British troops are on their march for Portugal." In his reply at the close of the debate, Mr. Canning again displayed great eloquence; and on this occasion he used a famous but somewhat bombastic expression. "If France," said he, "occupied Spain, was it necessary, in order to avoid the consequences of that occupation, that we should blockade Cadiz. No. I looked another way; I sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere. Contemplating Spain, such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain 'with the Indies.' I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old."

A Despatch in Cypher.—Sir Charles Bagot, our Ambassador at the Hague, was one day attending at court, when a despatch in cypher was hastily put into his hand. It was very short, and evidently very urgent; but, unfortunately, Sir Charles, not expecting such a communication, had not the key of the cypher with him. An interval of intense anxiety followed, until he obtained the key; when, to his infinite astonishment, he deciphered the following despatch from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs:—

"In matters of commerce, the fault of the Dutch
Is giving too little and asking too much;

With equal advantage the French are content,
So we'll clap on Dutch bottoms a twenty per cent.
Twenty per cent.,
Twenty per cent.,
Nous frapperons Falck with twenty per cent.
GEORGE CANNING."

—*Bell's "Life of Canning."*

IMPROMPTU ON WHITBREAD.—The articles of impeachment against Lord Melville were moved by Mr. Whitbread. His speech (says Mr. Bell) was clear and able; but some passages struck Mr. Canning's acute sense of the ridiculous so forcibly, that he scribbled a parody on them, while Mr. Whitbread was yet speaking. The following is the impromptu :—

"FRAGMENT OF AN ORATION.

"I'm like Archimedes for science and skill;
I'm like a young prince going straight up a hill;
I'm like (with respect to the fair be it said),
I'm like a young lady just bringing to bed.
If you ask why the 11th of June I remember,
Much better than April, or May, or November,
On that day, my lords, with truth I assure ye,
My sainted progenitor set up his brewery;
On that day, in the morn, he began brewing beer;
On that day, too, commenced his connubial career;
On that day he received and he issued his bills;
On that day he cleared out all the cash from his tills;
On that day he died, having finished his summing,
And the angels all cried, 'Here's old Whitbread a-coming.'
So that day still I hail with a smile and a sigh,
For his beer with an E, and his bier with an I;
And still on that day, in the hottest of weather,
The whole Whitbread family dine altogether.—
So long as the beams of this house shall support
The roof which o'ershades this respectable court,
Where Hastings was tried for oppressing the Hindoos;
So long as that sun shall shine in at those windows,
My name shall shine bright as my ancestor's shines,
Mine recorded in journals, *his* blazoned on signs!"

AN UNDEBATABLE SUBJECT.—The following letter is

given in Stapleton's "George Canning and his Times":—"Foreign Office, January 27th, 1826. My Dear Granville,—It occurs to me, since the sealing of my letter enclosing the Speech, that M. Villèle may possibly inquire why we have not mentioned the death of the Emperor of Russia. 1. It is not usual to mention the death of foreign sovereigns in the King's Speech. 2. We did not mention that of Louis XVIII. 3. The reason of this habitual silence is a sound one. The King mentions nothing that Parliament is not expected to echo. Parliament echoes nothing without discussion. To bring a deceased foreign sovereign before Parliament for discussion would be to treat him as the ancient Egyptians did *their own* kings—judge him immediately after his death, a liberty unwarrantable with the sovereigns of other nations.—Ever affectionately yours, George Canning."

His Death at Chiswick.—Lady Holland told me that in 1827 Mr. Canning, then ill, mentioned to her that he was going for change and repose to Chiswick, a country seat of the Duke of Devonshire. She said to him, "Do not go there; if I were your wife I would not allow you to do so." "Why not?" asked Mr. Canning. "Mr. Fox died there." Mr. Canning smiled; and an hour after, on leaving Holland House, he returned to Lady Holland, and said to her, in a low tone, "Do not speak of this to any one; it might disturb them." "And he died at Chiswick," concluded Lady Holland, with emotion.—*Guizot's "Embassy to the Court of St. James's."*

LORD CASTLEREAGH.

Common-place Oratory.—No man (remarks Lord Brougham) ever attained the station of a regular debater in our Parliament with such an entire want of all classical accomplishment, and indeed of all literary provision whatsoever. While he never showed the least symptom of an

information extending beyond the more recent volumes of the "Parliamentary Debates," or possibly the files of the newspapers only, his diction set all imitation, perhaps all description, at defiance. It was with some an amusement to beguile the tedious hours of their unavoidable attendance upon the poor, tawdry, ravelled thread of his sorry discourse, to collect a kind of *ana* from the fragments, of mixed, incongruous, and disjointed images that frequently appeared in it. "The features of the clause;" "the ignorant impatience of the relaxation of taxation;" "sets of circumstances coming up and circumstances going down;" "men turning their backs upon themselves;" "the honourable and learned gentleman's wedge getting into the loyal feelings of the manufacturing classes;" "the constitutional principle wound up in the bowels of the monarchical principle;" "the Herculean labour of the honourable and learned member, who will find himself quite disappointed when he has at last brought forth his Hercules" (by a slight confounding of his mother's labour, which produced that hero, with his own exploits which gained him immortality)—these are but a few, and not the richest samples, by any means, of a rhetoric which often baffled alike the gravity of the Treasury bench and the art of the reporter, and left the wondering audience at a loss to conjecture how anyone could ever exist, endowed with humbler pretensions to the name of orator.—*Historical Sketches of Statesmen.*

Courageous Leadership.—When the Tory party, "having a devil," preferred Lord Castlereagh to Mr. Canning for their leader, all men naturally expected that he would entirely fail to command even the attendance of the House while he addressed it, and that the benches, empty during his time, would only be replenished when his highly-gifted competitor rose. They were greatly deceived; they under-rated the effect of place and power; they forgot that the representative of a Government speaks

"as one having authority, and not as the scribes;" but they also forgot that Lord Castlereagh had some qualities well fitted to conciliate favour, and even to provoke admiration, in the absence of everything like eloquence, and without ever having written a line in the *Anti-Jacobin*. He was a bold and fearless man: the very courage with which he exposed himself unabashed to the most critical audience in the world, while incapable of uttering two sentences of anything but the meanest matter, in the most wretched language; the gallantry with which he faced the greatest difficulties of a question; the unflinching perseverance with which he went through a whole subject, leaving untouched not one of its points, whether he could grapple with it or no, and not one of the adverse arguments, however forcibly and felicitously they had been urged, neither daunted by recollecting the impression just made by his antagonist's brilliant display, nor damped by consciousness of the very rags in which he now presented himself—all this made him, upon the whole, rather a favourite with the audience whose patience he was taxing mercilessly, and whose gravity he ever and anon put to a very severe trial. Nor can anyone have forgotten the kind of pride that mantled on the fronts of the Tory phalanx, when, after being overwhelmed with the powerful fire of the Whig Opposition, or galled by the fierce denunciations of the "Mountain," or harassed by the brilliant though often tinsel displays of Mr. Canning, their chosen leader stood forth, and presenting the graces of his eminently patrician figure, flung open his coat, displayed an azure ribbon traversing a snow-white chest, and declared "his high satisfaction that he could now meet the charges against him face to face, and repel with indignation all that his adversaries were bold and rash enough to advance."—*Ibid.*

Light out of Darkness.—On one occasion Castlereagh had gone on for an hour speaking upon what

subject no man could guess, when he exclaimed of a sudden, "So much, Mr. Speaker, for the law of nations." On another occasion, when he had spoken for an hour tediously and confusedly, he declared, "I have now proved that the Tower of London is a common law principle."—*Introduction. to Earl Russell's "Speeches."* "Before he spoke," said Lord Granville, "he would collect what he could on the subject, but never spoke above the level of a newspaper. Had three things in his favour: tact, good humour, and courage."—*S. Rogers' "Recollections."* But some could see more in Castlereagh than many of his critics would allow. Thus Bulwer, in "St. Stephen's"—

> "They much, in truth, misjudge him who explain
> His graceless language by a witless brain.
> So firm his purpose, so resolved his will,
> It almost seem'd a craft to speak so ill—
> As if, like Cromwell, flashing towards his end,
> Through cloudy verbiage none could comprehend."

Ignorant Impatience of Taxation.—Lord Castlereagh (says Alison) was at times eminently imprudent in expression, especially in those curt and pithy sayings which are easily recollected, and strike between wind and water the prevailing prejudices of the day. His sayings on these occasions were generally perfectly true, but that only rendered them more provoking, and induced the greater hostility against him. * * * Never was a truer expression than "the ignorant impatience of taxation," of which he complained when the income-tax was thrown out in 1816. —*Life of Castlereagh.* Mr. Gladstone quoted this phrase when he introduced his "Commercial Treaty" budget in 1860. He said, "It was Lord Londonderry* who complained of the people of England as exhibiting an 'ignorant

* Castlereagh's later title.

impatience of taxation;' but I think, were he to rise from the dead and again take his place in this House, he would be very much more likely to complain of an ignorant patience of taxation."

The Currycomb of the House.—The following entry appears in the Journal of Sir James Mackintosh:—"March 22nd, 1817. F—— said it was delightful to see how completely the currycomb of the House of Commons had taken off all the gilding and lackering that Castlereagh had brought from the Congress."

Taking Things Coolly.—At the time of the trial of Queen Caroline (1820) the general transports raised the popular exasperation against Lords Castlereagh and Sidmouth, the supposed authors of the proceedings, to the highest point; they never appeared in the streets without being hooted and reviled by the mob, and both daily received anonymous letters threatening them with instant death if the Bill against her Majesty were not abandoned. These intrepid men, however, disregarded those threats, and walked about the streets as usual, without any attendants; and the people, admiring this spirit, abstained from actual violence. One day at this time they were walking together in Parliament Street, when, being recognised, a large mob got up round them, and they were violently hooted. "Here we go," said Lord Sidmouth, "the two most popular men in England." "Yes," replied Lord Castlereagh, "through a grateful and admiring multitude."—*Alison's "Life of Castlereagh."*

Insulting Language in Parliament.—Nothing could be more just than the rebuke which, as connected with the question of personal courage, we may recollect his administering to a great man who had passed the limits of Parliamentary courtesy. "Every one must be sensible," he said, "that if any personal quarrel were desired, any insulting language used publicly where it could not be met as it

deserved, was the way to prevent and not to produce such a rencounter."—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

His Duel with Canning.—Unknown to Lord Castlereagh, and without giving him the slightest reason to suspect its existence, a party had been formed in the Cabinet inimical to him, and the object of which was to get him removed from his position as Minister at War, and Lord Wellesley substituted in his room. This was arranged (says Alison, in his "Life of Castlereagh") by the whole Cabinet, with the exception of his lordship, as early as the 4th of April, 1809. * * * It was not till Lord Castlereagh was shown the correspondence of Mr. Canning by Mr. Perceval that he showed any resentment or unpleasant feeling on the subject. It was from that he learned how early his removal had been consented to by his Majesty and his colleagues, and it was in that he met with passages which induced him to challenge Mr. Canning. * * * Lord Castlereagh, conceiving that the whole was an intrigue of Mr. Canning's to get him removed from office in order to facilitate his own advancement, and that he himself had been ill-used by being allowed so long, and at so critical a juncture, to retain the responsibility of office when his removal had been not only resolved on by the Cabinet, but submitted to his Majesty and approved by him, sent Mr. Canning a challenge. The parties met on Putney Heath, September 21st, and exchanged shots. Mr. Canning's fire did not take effect; but that of Lord Castlereagh inflicted a severe flesh wound on the thigh of his adversary, which fortunately did not prove mortal.

A Lover of Ireland.—"It is said," remarks Earl Russell, "that when Grattan's friends were assembled round his bed, the dying patriot said to them, 'Don't be hard upon Castlereagh—he loves our country.' It is added that when Lord Castlereagh heard of these words of his great opponent, he burst into tears. I cannot vouch for the truth of this anecdote, but I think it probably authentic."

DEATH OF CASTLEREAGH.—On the 9th August, 1822, the Duke of Wellington was so much struck with the manner of Lord Castlereagh that, after walking with him to the Foreign Office, he went to his medical attendant, Dr. Bankhead, and not finding him at home, wrote a letter expressing his apprehensions, and not obscurely hinting at mental delusions. Dr. Bankhead no sooner received this alarming intelligence than he went out to Cray Farm, Lord Castlereagh's seat in Kent, and seeing the Duke of Wellington's fears too well founded, he slept in the house the next two nights, and gave orders to his valet to remove the razors from his lordship's dressing-case, and take other precautions against self-destruction. He did so without being observed; but, unfortunately, not recollecting that there was a penknife belonging to the case in one of the drawers of the washing-stand, he neglected to secure it. The consequences were fatal. During the 10th and 11th of August Castlereagh remained in bed, wandering, but expressing no alarming intentions. On the morning of the 12th of August, Lady Londonderry, who was with him, reported that he had passed a restless night, and that he wished to see Dr. Bankhead, who was in an adjoining apartment. When Dr. Bankhead went into his dressing-room, he found him standing opposite the window, looking out, with his hands above his head, with his throat cut and bleeding profusely. Consciousness, as is often the case, returned with the flow of blood. He threw his arms round the doctor's neck, and saying, in a feeble voice, "Bankhead, let me fall on your arm; I have opened my neck; it is all over!" sank on the ground and expired.—*Alison's "Life of Castlereagh."*

THE EARL OF CHATHAM.

THE TERRIBLE CORNET.—The antagonist whom Lord Chatham first encountered, on his entering into public life,

was the veteran Walpole, who instinctively dreaded him the moment he heard his voice, and exclaimed, "We must muzzle that terrible cornet of horse!"—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

Chatham's Personal Characteristics.—Those who saw him in his decay—when his health was broken, when his mind was untuned, when he had been removed from that stormy assembly of which he thoroughly knew the temper, and over which he possessed unbounded influence, to a small, a torpid, and an unfriendly audience, —say that his speaking was then, for the most part, a low, monotonous muttering, audible only to those who sat close to him; that when violently excited he sometimes raised his voice for a few minutes, but that it soon sank again into an unintelligible murmur. Such was the Earl of Chatham; but such was not William Pitt. His figure, when he first appeared in Parliament, was strikingly graceful and commanding, his features high and noble, his eye full of fire. His voice, even when it sank to a whisper, was heard to the remotest benches; and when he strained it to its full extent, the sound rose like the swell of an organ of a great cathedral, shook the house with its peal, and was heard through lobbies and down staircases to the Court of Requests and the precincts of Westminster Hall. He cultivated all these eminent advantages with the most assiduous care. His action is described by a very malignant observer as equal to that of Garrick. His play of countenance was wonderful; he frequently disconcerted a hostile orator by a single glance of indignation or scorn. Every tone, from the impassioned cry to the thrilling aside, was perfectly at his command. It is by no means improbable that the pains which he took to improve his great personal advantages had, in some respects, a prejudicial operation, and tended to nourish in him that passion for theatrical effect which was one of the most conspicuous blemishes in his character.—*Macaulay's Essay.*

His Imposing Manner.—In his earlier time, his whole manner is represented as having been beyond conception animated and imposing. Indeed, the things which he effected principally by means of it, or at least which nothing but a most striking and commanding tone could have made it possible to attempt, almost exceed belief. Some of these sallies are, indeed, examples of that approach made to the ludicrous by the sublime which has been charged upon him as a prevailing fault. * * It is related that once, in the House of Commons, he began a speech with the words, "Sugar, Mr. Speaker, ——" and then, observing a smile to pervade the audience, he paused, looked fiercely around, and with a loud voice, rising in its notes and swelling into vehement anger, he is said to have pronounced again the word "Sugar!" three times; and having thus quelled the House, and extinguished every appearance of levity or laughter, turned round and disdainfully asked, "Who will laugh at sugar now?"—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

Fixing a Charge.—On one occasion Chatham said, "Who are the evil advisers of his Majesty? I would say to them, Is it you? Is it you? Is it you?" (pointing to the ministers, until he came near Lord Mansfield). There were several lords around him, and Lord Chatham said, "My lords, please to take your seats." When they had sat down, he pointed to Lord Mansfield, and said, "Is it you? *Methinks Felix trembles.*"—*Grattan* (*"Life and Times"*).

Compelling a Retractation. — Mr. Moreton, the Chief Justice of Chester, happened to say in the House, "King, Lords, and Commons, or (directing his eye towards Pitt), as that right honourable member would call them, Commons, Lords, and King." Pitt arose with great deliberation, and called to order. "I have," he said, "heard frequently in this House doctrines which have surprised me; but now my blood runs cold. I desire the words of the honourable member may be taken down." The clerks of

the House wrote the words. "Bring them to me," said Pitt, in his loudest voice. By this time Mr. Moreton was frightened out of his senses. "Sir," he said, addressing himself to the Speaker, "I am sorry to have given any offence to the right honourable member or to the House. I meant nothing. King, Lords, and Commons—Lords, King, and Commons—Commons, Lords, and King; *tria juncta in uno.* I meant nothing; indeed I meant nothing." "I don't wish to push the matter further," said Pitt. "The moment a man acknowledges his error, he ceases to be guilty. I have a great regard for the honourable member, and, as instance of that regard, I give him this advice: whenever that member *means* nothing, I recommend him to *say* nothing."—*Butler's "Reminiscences."*

Chatham and the French Minister.—A letter published in the "Grenville Papers," from Mr. Jenkinson to Mr. Grenville, June 23rd, 1761, contains the following passage:—"Bussi is horrified with Mr. Pitt's presence, which makes him act in the manner he does." The editor of the Papers adds, "In one of Stanley's most secret letters to Mr. Pitt he says, 'M. de Bussi was nominated minister at our Court before the expedition against Belleisle was even thought of here. * * * When the Duc de Choiseul informed me of the awe with which he was struck by you, he said he was not surprised at it—*car le pauvre diable tremblait de peur en partant;* he was so much frightened that he wrote for a passport to return. The Duc showed me this request in his own hand—the Duc was with the King, at Marli, when he received it. His reflection upon it was: *Apparemment, sire, qu'il a deplû à M. Pitt, qui l'aura fait sauter par les fenêtres.*' I replied, '*Je n'aurais pas trouvé bon dans ce cas de faire la même gambade par manière de représailles.*'"

His Oratory.—Macaulay observes, in his essay on Chatham, "He was no speaker of set speeches. His few prepared discourses were complete failures. The

elaborate panegyric which he pronounced on General Wolfe was considered as the very worst of all his performances. 'No man,' says a critic who had often heard him, 'ever knew so little what he was going to say.' Indeed, his facility amounted to a vice. He was not the master, but the slave of his own speech. So little self-command had he when once he felt the impulse, that he did not like to take part in a debate when his mind was full of an important secret of State. 'I must sit still,' he once said to Lord Shelburne on such an occasion; 'for, when once I am up, everything that is in my mind comes out.'" Lord Brougham remarks, "He was prolix in the whole texture of his discourse, and he was certainly the first who introduced into our Senate the practice, adopted in the American War by Mr. Burke, and continued by others, of long speeches —speeches of two and three hours—by which oratory has gained little, and business less." Grattan said, "I heard him several times when I was at the Temple—on the American War, on the King's Speech in 1770, and on the privileges of Parliament. He was very great, and very odd. He spoke in a style of conversation; not, however, what I expected: it was not a speech, for he never came with a prepared harangue. His style was not regular oratory, like Cicero or Demosthenes, but it was very fine and very elevated. He appeared more like a grave character advising than mingling in the debate. His gesture was always graceful; he was an incomparable actor. Had it not been so, it would have appeared ridiculous. His address to the tapestry* and to Lord Effingham's memory required a fine actor, and he was that actor."

* "I invoke the genius of the Constitution. From the tapestry that adorns these walls the immortal ancestor of this noble lord frowns with indignation at the disgrace of his country. In vain did he defend the liberty, and establish the religion of Britain, against the tyranny of Rome, if these worse than Popish cruelties and inquisitorial practices are endured among us."—*Speech against the Employment of Indians in the War with America.*

Employment of Indians by Chatham.—The Earl of Chatham's famous speech against the employment of Indians in the war with the American colonies, was followed by his adversaries (soon afterwards, if not at the time) with the retort that he himself had employed Indians in a similar conflict. The following particulars were communicated to Lord Brougham by "a most accomplished and venerable person, the ornament of a former age," and appear in an appendix to the "Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of George III.": —"The very same thing had been done in the former war carried on in Canada, by his authority and under his own immediate superintendence; the French had arrayed a tribe of these savage warriors against us, and we, without scruple, arrayed another against them. This he thought fit to deny in the most positive manner, although the ministers offered to produce documents written by himself that proved it, from among the papers at the Secretary's office. A warm debate ensued, and at length Lord Amherst, the general who commanded our troops in that Canadian war, was so loudly appealed to on all sides, that it compelled him to rise, and most unwillingly (for he greatly respected Lord Chatham) falter out a few words; enough, however, to acknowledge the fact—a fact admitted generally, and even assumed by the Opposition lords who spoke afterwards. They seemed to lay the question quietly by, as far as it concerned Lord Chatham's veracity, and only insisted upon the difference between the two wars—the one foreign, the other civil; arguing, also, that we might have been under some necessity of using retaliation, since the French certainly first began the practice so justly abhorred. The *Annual Register* for 1777 states that Mr. Burke took the same course in the House of Commons. Upon hearing what had passed in the House of Lords, Lord Bute exclaimed with astonishment, 'Did Pitt really deny it? Why, I have letters of his still by me, singing *Io Pæans*

over the advantages we gained through our Indian allies.' Could what he thus said have been untrue, when it was almost a soliloquy spoken rather *before* than *to* his wife and daughters, the only persons present? The letters he mentioned were probably neither official nor confidential, but such common notes as might pass between him and Lord Chatham while still upon a footing of some intimacy. It must be observed that, in 1777, Lord Bute had long withdrawn from all political connections, lived in great retirement, and had no intercourse whatever with the people then in power."

Strong Terms respecting a King's Speech.—The Speech from the Throne respecting the affair of Falkland's Island had stated that the Spanish Government had disowned the act of its officer. Lord Chatham said: "There never was a more odious, a more infamous falsehood imposed on a great nation. It degrades the King, it insults the Parliament. His Majesty has been advised to affirm an absolute falsehood. My Lords, I beg your attention, and I hope I shall be understood when I repeat that it is an absolute, a palpable falsehood. The King of Spain disowns the thief, while he leaves him unpunished, and profits by his theft. In vulgar English, he is the receiver of stolen goods, and should be treated accordingly."—*Ibid.*

The Dignity of the House of Commons.—Fox, writing to Lord Hartington on the subject of the Berwick election in 1754, at which Wilkes spent, although unsuccessfully, between £3,000 and £4,000, says, "Mr. Wilkes, a friend it seems of Pitt's, petitioned against the younger Delaval, chose at Berwick, on account of bribery only. The younger Delaval made a speech on his being thus attacked, full of wit, humour, and buffoonery, which kept the House in a continued roar of laughter. Mr. Pitt came down from the gallery and took it up in his highest tone of dignity. He was astonished when he heard what had been the occasion

of their mirth. Was the dignity of the House of Commons on so sure foundations that they might venture themselves to shake it? Had it not, on the contrary, by gradations, been diminishing for years, till now we were brought to the very brink of the precipice, where, if ever, a stand must be made."—"*Memoirs*," *by Lord Waldegrave.*

Stabbing the Constitution.—In the debate (May 1st, 1770) which arose on Lord Marchmont's famous midnight motion, "That any interference of the Lords respecting the Middlesex election would be unconstitutional," Lord Chatham exclaimed, "If the constitution must be wounded, let it not receive its mortal stab at this dark and midnight hour."—*Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors."*

Posthumous Praise.—No one can suspect Pitt of paying a tribute of applause to the memory of Walpole from mean and adulatory motives; yet even he observed, in the House of Commons, that Sir Robert Walpole was a very able minister. Perceiving several members laugh, he added, "The more I reflect on my conduct the more I blame myself for opposing the Excise Bill;" and then concluded by saying, with his usual energy, "Let those who are ashamed to confess their errors laugh out. Can it be deemed adulation to praise a minister who is no more?" The whole House seemed abashed, and became silent.—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

The "Gentle Shepherd."—Dashwood's financial statement had been confused and absurd beyond belief, and had been received by the House with roars of laughter. He had sense enough to be conscious of his unfitness for the high situation which he held, and exclaimed, in a comical fit of despair, "What shall I do? The boys will point at me in the street, and cry, 'There goes the worst Chancellor of the Exchequer that ever was.'" George Grenville came to the rescue, and spoke strongly on his favourite theme, the profusion with which the late war had

been carried on. That profusion, he said, had made taxes necessary. He called on the gentlemen opposite to him to say where they would have a tax laid, and dwelt on this topic with his usual prolixity. "Let them tell me where," he repeated in a monotonous and somewhat fretful tone. "I say, sir, let them tell me where. I repeat it, sir; I am entitled to say to them, Tell me where." Unluckily for him, Pitt had come down to the House that night, and had been bitterly provoked by the reflections thrown on the war. He revenged himself by murmuring, in a whine resembling Grenville's, a line of a well-known song, "Gentle shepherd, tell me where." "If," cried Grenville, "gentlemen are to be treated in this way——" Pitt, as was his fashion, when he meant to mark extreme contempt, rose deliberately, made his bow, and walked out of the House, leaving his brother-in-law in convulsions of rage, and everybody else in convulsions of laughter. It was long before Grenville lost the nickname of the Gentle Shepherd.—*Macaulay's Essay on Chatham.*

A Clinical Consultation.—Mr. Pitt's plan when he had the gout was to have no fire in his room, but to load himself with bed-clothes. At his house at Hayes he slept in a long room, at one end of which was his bed, and his lady's at the other. His way was, when he thought the Duke of Newcastle had fallen into any mistake, to send for him and read him a lecture. The duke was sent for once, and came, when Mr. Pitt was confined to bed by the gout. There was, as usual, no fire in the room; the day was very chilly, and the duke, as usual, afraid of catching cold. The duke first sat down on Mrs. Pitt's bed, as the warmest place; then drew up his legs into it, as he got colder. The lecture, unluckily, continuing a considerable time, the duke at length fairly lodged himself under Mrs. Pitt's bed-clothes. A person from whom I had the story suddenly going in saw the two Ministers in bed, at the two ends of the room, while

Pitt's long nose and black beard unshaved for some days, added to the grotesque nature of the scene.—*Walpoliana.*

Youth and Age.—There is a statement which, having found its way into such an authority as "Chandler's Debates," has been incorporated in works pretending to historical accuracy. On a debate arising out of the Bill for the Encouragement and Increase of Seamen, in 1740, Pitt is represented as attacking Mr. Horace Walpole (uncle of the more celebrated Horace) for having ventured on a reference to his youth. The fact is that these debates were imaginary, or constructed on a very slight foundation. Dr. Johnson, as is well known, before he had obtained his colossal reputation, drew up fictitious reports of what took place in the House of Commons. Mr. Horace Walpole having in a discussion been severely handled by Pitt, Lyttleton, and the Granvilles, all of whom were much his juniors, lamented that though he had been so long in business young men should be found so much better informed in political matters than himself. He added that he had at least one consolation in remembering that his own son, being twenty years of age, must be as much the superior of Pitt, Lyttleton, and the Granvilles, as they were wiser than himself. Pitt, having his youth thus mercilessly flung in his face, got up in a rage, commencing, "With the greatest reverence to the grey hairs of the gentleman——" but was stopped by Mr. Walpole pulling off his wig, and disclosing a grizzled poll beneath. This excited very general laughter, in which Pitt joined with such heartiness as quite to forget his anger.—*Warburton's "Memoirs of Horace Walpole."*

Effect of his Elevation to the Peerage.—Those (says Macaulay) who had most loved and honoured the great Commoner were loudest in invective against the new-made Lord. London had hitherto been true to him through every vicissitude. When the citizens learned that he had

been sent for from Somersetshire, that he had been closeted with the King at Richmond, and that he was to be First Minister, they had been in transports of joy. Preparations were made for a grand entertainment and for a general illumination. The lamps had actually been placed round the Monument, when the *Gazette* announced that the object of all this enthusiasm was an Earl. Instantly the feast was countermanded. The lamps were taken down. The newspapers raised the roar of obloquy. Pamphlets, made up of calumny and scurrility, filled the shops of all the booksellers. * * * It was now the fashion to compare the two Williams, William Pulteney and William Pitt. Both, it was said, had, by eloquence and simulated patriotism, acquired a great ascendancy in the House of Commons and in the country. Both had been entrusted with the office of reforming the Government. Both had, when at the height of power and popularity, been seduced by the splendour of the coronet. Both had been made earls, and both had at once become objects of aversion and scorn to the nation which a few hours before had regarded them with affection and veneration. The clamour against Pitt appears to have had a serious effect on the foreign relations of the country. His name had till now acted like a spell at Versailles and Saint Ildefonso. English travellers on the Continent had remarked that nothing more was necessary to silence a whole room full of boasting Frenchmen than to drop a hint of the probability that Mr. Pitt would return to power. In an instant there was deep silence: all shoulders rose, and all faces were lengthened. Now, unhappily, every foreign court, in learning that he was recalled to office, learned also that he no longer possessed the hearts of his countrymen. Ceasing to be loved at home, he ceased to be feared abroad. The name of Pitt had been a charmed name. Our envoys tried in vain to conjure with the name of Chatham.

The Death of Chatham.—The Duke of Richmond

gave notice that on the 7th of April, 1778, he would move an address to the King, entreating him to withdraw his fleets and armies from America, and make peace with the revolted colonies. Lord Chatham was at the time at Hayes, slowly recovering from a fit of the gout; but the moment he heard of the intended address, he resolved to attend the House of Lords, and neither his family nor his friends could induce him to desist from his purpose. On the 7th of April, accordingly, he came into the House with feeble steps, leaning with one arm on his son, William Pitt, and with the other on his son-in-law, Lord Mahon. After the Duke of Richmond had spoken, Lord Chatham rose. "The earl spoke," writes Lord Camden to the Duke of Grafton, "but was not like himself; his speech faltered, his sentences broken, and his mind not master of itself. His words were shreds of unconnected eloquence, and flashes of the same fire which he, Prometheus-like, had stolen from heaven, and were then returning to the place from whence they were taken. Your grace sees even I, who am a mere prose man, am tempted to be poetical while I am discoursing of this extraordinary man's genius." * * * The Duke of Richmond answered Lord Chatham. He rose to reply, but nature was exhausted; "he fell back," says Lord Camden, "upon his seat, and was to all appearance in the agonies of death. This threw the whole House into confusion; every person was upon his legs in a moment, hurrying from one place to another, some sending for assistance, others producing salts, and others reviving spirits. Many crowding about the earl to observe his countenance; all affected; most part really concerned; and even those who might have felt a real pleasure at the accident, yet put on the appearance of distress." * * * Lord Chatham was carried into the Prince's chamber, and laid upon the table, supported by pillows. After a few days he recovered sufficiently to be removed to Hayes. But the attack was fatal. He expired

" at Hayes on the 11th of May following.—*From Russell's "Life of Fox."*

Examples of his Eloquence.

Lord Brougham gives the following, among other examples of Chatham's oratory, in his "Historical Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of George III." :—

"All our knowledge of the peculiar nature of his oratory rests upon a few scattered fragments. There is, however, some security for our deducing from these a correct notion of it, because they certainly, according to all accounts, were the portions of his discourse which produced the most extraordinary effect, on which its fame rests, and by which its quality is to be ascertained.

"His remark on confidence, when it was asked by the Ministry of 1766, for whom he had some forbearance rather than any great respect, is well known. He said their characters were fair enough, and he was always glad to see such persons engaged in the public service; but, turning to them with a smile, very courteous but not very respectful, he said, 'Confide in you? Oh, no; you must pardon me, gentlemen. *Youth* is the season of credulity; confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom!'

"Some one, having spoken of the obstinacy of America, said 'that she was almost in open rebellion.' Mr. Pitt exclaimed, 'I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to let themselves be made slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest!'* Then speaking of the attempt to keep her down—'In a just cause of quarrel you may crush America to atoms; but in

* He added, in allusion to a previous quotation of precedents, "I come not here armed at all points with law cases and Acts of Parliament, with the Statute-books doubled down in dog's-ears, to defend the cause of liberty."—*Russell's "Fox."*

this crying injustice' (Stamp Act) 'I am one who will lift up my hands against it. In such a cause even your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like the strong man; she would embrace the pillars of the State, and pull down the constitution along with her. Is this your boasted peace—to sheathe the sword, not in its scabbard, but in the bowels of your countrymen?'

"'Those iron barons (for so I may call them when compared with the silken barons of modern days) were the guardians of the people; and three words of their barbarous Latin, *nullus liber homo*, are worth all the classics. Yet their virtues were never tried in a question so important as this' (the pretension of privilege in the House of Commons). 'A breach is made in the constitution—the battlements are dismantled—the citadel is open to the first invader—the walls totter—the place is no longer tenable. What, then, remains for us but to stand foremost in the breach, to repair it, or to perish in it? Unlimited power corrupts the possessor; and this I know, that where law ends, there tyranny begins.'

"Again, he said: 'Magna Charta—the Petition of Right—the Bill of Rights—form the Bible of the English constitution. Had some of the King's unhappy predecessors trusted less to the commentary of their advisers, and been better read in the text itself, the glorious Revolution might have remained only possible in theory, and their fate would not now have stood upon record, a formidable example to all their successors.'

"In 1775 he made a most brilliant speech on the war. Speaking of General Gage's inactivity, he said it could not be blamed; it was inevitable. 'But what a miserable condition,' he exclaimed, 'is ours, where disgrace is prudence, and where it is necessary to be contemptible! You must repeal these Acts' (he said, alluding to the Boston Ports and Massachusetts Bay Bills), 'and you WILL repeal them.

I pledge myself for it, that you will repeal them. I stake my reputation on it. I will consent to be taken for an idiot if they are not finally repealed.' Every one knows how true this prophecy proved. The concluding sentence of the speech has been often cited—'If the Ministers persevere in misleading the King, I will not say that they can alienate the affections of his subjects from his Crown; but I will affirm that they will make the crown not worth his wearing. I will not say that the King is betrayed; but I will pronounce that the kingdom is undone.'

"Again, in 1777, after describing the cause of the war and 'the traffic and barter driven with every little pitiful German prince that sells his subjects to the shambles of a foreign country,' he adds, 'The mercenary aid on which you rely irritates to an incurable resentment the minds of your enemies, whom you overrun with the sordid sons of rapine and of plunder, devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hireling cruelty. If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never! never! never!'

"There are other celebrated passages of his speeches in all men's mouths. His indignant and contemptuous answer to the Minister's boast of driving the Americans before the army—'I might as well think of driving them before me with this crutch!'—is well known. Perhaps the finest of them all is his allusion to the maxim of English law, that every man's house is his castle. 'The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail—its roof may shake—the wind may blow through it—the storm may enter—the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter!—all his force dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement!'"

THE EARL OF CHESTERFIELD.

Bleeding for One's Country.—Lord R——, with many good qualities, and even learning and parts, had a strong desire of being thought skilful in physic, and was very expert in bleeding. Lord Chesterfield, who knew his foible, and on a particular occasion wished to have his vote, came to him one morning, and, after having conversed upon indifferent matters, complained of the headache, and desired his lordship to feel his pulse. It was found to beat high, and a hint of losing blood given. "I have no objection; and, as I hear your lordship has a masterly hand, will you favour me with trying your lancet upon me? *Apropos*," said Lord Chesterfield, after the operation, "do you go to the House to-day?" Lord R—— answered, "I did not intend to go, not being sufficiently informed of the question which is to be debated; but you, who have considered it, which side will you be of?" The earl, having gained his confidence, easily directed his judgment; he carried him to the House, and got him to vote as he pleased. He used afterwards to say that none of his friends had done so much as he, having literally bled for the good of his country.—*Maty's "Memoir of Chesterfield."*

Dexterity with a Difficult Subject.—A bill for the reform of the Calendar was introduced in the House of Lords by Lord Chesterfield in 1751, and in his "Letters" he thus alludes to his speech:—"This bill was necessarily composed of law jargon and astronomical calculations, to both which I am an utter stranger. However, it was absolutely necessary to make the House of Lords think that I knew something of the matter, and also to make them believe that they knew something of it themselves, which they do not. For my own part, I could just as soon have talked Celtic or Sclavonian to them as astronomy, and they

would have understood me full as well; so I resolved to do better than speak to the purpose, and to please instead of informing them. I gave them, therefore, only an historical account of calendars, from the Egyptian down to the Gregorian, amusing them now and then with little episodes; but I was particularly attentive to the choice of my words, to the harmony and soundness of my periods, to my elocution, to my action. This succeeded, and ever will succeed. They thought I informed, because I pleased them; and many of them said that I had made the whole very clear to them, when, God knows, I had not even attempted it. Lord Macclesfield, who had the greatest share in framing the bill, and who is one of the greatest mathematicians and astronomers in Europe, spoke afterwards with infinite knowledge, and all the clearness that so intricate a matter would admit of; but, as his words, his periods, and his utterance were not near so good as mine, the preference was most unanimously, though most unjustly, given to me. This will ever be the case; every numerous assembly is a mob, let the individuals who compose it be what they will."

A Hint to Statesmen. — The Earl of Chesterfield delivered a speech in the House of Lords, 1737, against the Play-house Bill. The following extract is from the "Parliamentary History":—"It is not licentiousness, it is an useful liberty, always indulged the stage in a free country, that some great men may there meet with a just reproof, which none of their friends will be free enough, or rather faithful enough, to give them. Of this we have a famous instance in the Roman history. The great Pompey, after the many victories he had obtained, and the great conquests he had made, had certainly a good title to the esteem of the people of Rome; yet that great man, by some error in his conduct, became an object of general dislike. And therefore, in the representation of an old play, when Diphilus, the actor, came to repeat these words, '*Nostrâ miseriâ tu es*

Magnus,' the audience immediately applied them to Pompey, who at that time was as well known by the name Magnus as by that of Pompey, and were so highly pleased with the satire that, as Cicero says, they made the actor repeat the words a hundred times over. An account of this was immediately sent to Pompey, who, instead of resenting it as an injury, was so wise as to take it for a just reproof; he examined his conduct, he altered his measures, he regained by degrees the esteem of the people, and then he neither feared the wit nor felt the satire of the stage. This is an example which ought to be followed by great men in all countries."

THE EARL OF CLARENDON.

Exciting Spanish Gratitude.—The Earl of Clarendon, who succeeded to the peerage on the death of his uncle in 1839, never sat in the House of Commons. His earlier years were devoted to diplomacy, and he had for some time filled the post of British Minister at Madrid, when he was called to the House of Lords, and resigned his ambassadorial functions. He had not been long a member of the Upper House when a debate on Spanish affairs arose, in which Lord Clarendon ably defended the policy of the Government he had represented, and spoke warmly of the prospects of Liberal institutions in Spain. His speech so pleased the Spaniards that it was circulated throughout the country, a gold medal was struck in his honour, and it was resolved to present the upholder of Spanish dignity with a handsome work of art.

"Drifting into War."—On the 14th of February, 1854, the Marquis of Clanricarde, in moving in the House of Lords for further information respecting the cessation of diplomatic relations with the Court of St. Petersburg, and the war which appeared imminent, inquired of the Government, "If we are at peace, what is the peace? and what is

the peace that is the object of the war?" In the course of his reply the Earl of Clarendon, then Foreign Minister, is reported in "Hansard" as replying, "The question had been asked whether we were at peace or war, and was one very difficult to answer distinctly. We are not at war, because war is not declared; we are not strictly at peace with Russia. (A laugh.) My noble friend may laugh; but he must know perfectly well that I am correct in saying that we are not at war with Russia, although diplomatic relations with that country are suspended. * * * Therefore, I consider that we are in the intermediate state; that our desire for peace is just as sincere as ever; but then, I must say that our hopes of maintaining it are gradually dwindling away, and that we are drifting towards war."

"Europe on a Mine."—The Earl of Clarendon used this expression with reference to the state of Europe before the Crimean war. In a speech on the 25th of May, 1855, he said: "We have learnt a great deal of the intentions of Russia, and the means she possessed of giving effect to those intentions. We now know what were the vast military resources of Russia, how stealthily they had been accumulated, and how readily they could be made available. We now know something of the almost incredible amount of warlike stores which had been accumulated in Sebastopol, where Russia had no commerce to protect, and we are also aware of the gigantic fortifications which were contemplated at Bomarsund. Why, Europe was really standing upon a mine without being aware of it, while the influence of Russia was so skilfully exercised as to paralyse both Governments and people. * * * The encroachments of Russia were unheeded, although her designs had been suspected and denounced; but it was nobody's business to interfere effectually, and no one wished to disturb the general peace until the mine which had been silently and slowly

prepared was exploded by the rashness of Prince Menchikoff."—*Hansard.*

WILLIAM COBBETT.

His First Appearance.—At the first general election after the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, Cobbett was returned for Oldham, and delivered his maiden speech January 29th, 1833, on the choice of a Speaker. The opening sentence with which he addressed the House was not of a very complimentary character:—"It appears to me that since I have been sitting here, I have heard a great deal of vain and unprofitable conversation." On the 11th of February he rose to move an amendment to the Report of the Address in answer to the King's Speech. "Other honourable members," he said, "may intercept the reading of the Report where they please, and move that such or such parts be omitted; for my own part, I object to every tittle of the Report after the words 'Most Gracious Majesty.'" Meeting with several interruptions by calls of "Question" and "Order," he said, "I have a very sacred duty to perform, and if the House be determined not to hear me to-night, I will certainly bring it forward to-morrow, and if the House will not hear me to-morrow, I will then bring it forward the day after. The statement I have to make I am determined to make, and that without any considerable interruption."

His Demeanour in the House.—I know no other instance of a man entering the House of Commons at his age (between sixty and seventy) and becoming at once an effective debater in it. Looking carelessly round the assembly so new to him, with his usual self-confidence he spoke on the first occasion that presented itself, proposing an amendment to the Address; but this was not his happiest effort, and consequently created disappointment. He soon, however, obliterated the failure, and became rather a

favourite with an audience which is only unforgiving when bored. It was still seen, moreover, that nothing daunted him; the murmurs, the "Oh!" or more serious reprehension and censure, found him shaking his head with his hands in his pockets, as cool and as defiant as when he first stuck up the picture of King George in his shop window at Philadelphia. He exhibited in Parliament, too, the same want of tact, prudence, and truth; the same egotism, the same combativeness, and the same reckless desire to struggle with received opinions, that had marked him previously through life, and shattered his career into glittering fragments, from which the world could never collect the image nor the practical utility of a whole.—*Bulwer's "Historical Characters."*

The Black Hole of St. Stephen's.—Complaining of the deficient accommodation for members in the House, Cobbett thus gave utterance to his discontent in the columns of the *Weekly Register:* "Why are we squeezed into so small a space that it is absolutely impossible that there should be calm and regular discussion, even from that circumstance alone? Why do we live in this hubbub? Why are we exposed to all these inconveniences? Why are 658 of us crammed into a space that allows to each of us no more than a foot and a half square, while, at the same time, each of the servants of the King, whom we pay, has a palace to live in, and more unoccupied space in that palace than the little hole into which we are all crammed to make the laws by which this great kingdom is governed." The fire of 1834, however, burned down the "little hole" so contemptuously spoken of by the member for Oldham, and thus made way for a more commodious structure.

His Influence.—People have about as substantial an idea of Cobbett as they have of Cribb. His blows are as hard, and he himself is as impenetrable. One has no notion of him as making use of a fine pen, but a great mutton-fist;

his style stuns his readers, and he "fillips the ear of the public with a three-man-beetle." He is too much for any single newspaper antagonist; "lays waste" a City orator or member of Parliament, and bears hard upon the Government itself. He is a kind of *fourth estate* in the politics of the country.—*Hazlitt's "Table Talk."*

Taking out the Sting.—Cobbett looked like a better sort of farmer. He was a very able man, but his career in the House was a complete failure. Though bold in public assemblies, he was timid and overawed in Parliament, and was never able to say more than a few sentences. * * * Cobbett was said to have "a good face for a grievance." I remember one trait which shows it. He moved to bring in a bill to modify the Stamp Act, more especially that part of it which obliged every one to give a twopenny stamp on payment of any sum between £2 and £5. Lord Althorp said that it would require great time for modification, and that it should be taken into consideration, but that meantime the member for Oldham might, if he liked, have that particular grievance of the twopenny stamp redressed at once. We all who were opposite to him were amused to observe that Cobbett looked quite disappointed, as if feeling that the sting was taken out of his complaints.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

Political Nicknames.—Cobbett's talent for fastening his claws into anything or any one by a word or an expression, and holding them down for scorn or up to horror, was unrivalled. "Prosperity Robinson," "Æolus Canning," the "Bloody *Times*," the "Pink-nosed Liverpool," the "unbaptised, buttonless blackguards" (in which way he designated the disciples of Penn), were expressions with which he attached ridicule where he could not fix reproach; and it is said that nothing was more teasing to Lord Erskine than being constantly addressed by his second title of Baron Clackmannan."—*Bulwer's "Historical Characters."*

RICHARD COBDEN.

"Unadorned Eloquence."—The compliment which was paid to Mr. Cobden by Sir Robert Peel, on the passing of the bills repealing the Corn Laws, is thus recorded by "Hansard": "The name which ought to be, and will be, associated with the success of those measures, is the name of one who, acting, I believe, from pure and disinterested motives, has, with untiring energy, made appeals to our reason, and has enforced those appeals with an eloquence the more to be admired because it was unaffected and unadorned: the name which ought to be chiefly associated with the success of those measures is the name of Richard Cobden."

The Minister's Responsibility.—During the discussion on the Corn Laws in 1843, Mr. Cobden, after having maintained that the agricultural population suffered as much from these laws as the manufacturing classes, and that the new law was as baneful as the old one, thus directly addressed Sir Robert Peel:—"What is the remedy you propose? What are the proceedings by which you propose to give relief to the country? You have acted on your own judgment, and you are responsible for the consequences of your act. You passed your law; you refused to listen to the manufacturers, and I throw upon you all the responsibility of your own measure. * * * The right honourable baronet says it is his duty to judge independently, and act without reference to any pressure; and I must tell the right honourable baronet that it is the duty of every honest and independent member to hold him individually responsible for the present position of the country. * * * I tell him that the whole responsibility of the lamentable and dangerous state of the country rests with him." On hearing this charge of responsibility, and

personal responsibility, so often and so vehemently repeated, Sir Robert rose with visible emotion. "The honourable gentleman," he said, "has stated here, very emphatically, what he has more than once stated at the conferences of the Anti-Corn-Law League, that he holds me individually—individually—responsible for the distress and suffering of the country; that he holds me personally responsible. But, be the consequences of these insinuations what they may, never will I be influenced by menaces, either in this House or out of this House, to adopt a course which I consider——" He was unable to complete his sentence. Whether friends or opponents, many members asked themselves what he meant, and why he was so much affected. It was perceived that the shade of Mr. Drummond [Sir Robert's secretary, who was assassinated January 21st, 1843] haunted his mind, and that the responsibility for the public distress, charged upon him with so much vehemence, struck him as a provocation to assassination. Mr. Cobden at once explained, protesting earnestly against so unjust a suspicion. * * * Sir Robert accepted his explanation, but coldly, and still maintained an air of reserved distrust.—*Guizot's "Memoirs of Peel."*

"Crumbling" Russia.—At a meeting in London in 1849, called to express sympathy with the people of Hungary, after the Russian intervention on behalf of Austria, Mr. Cobden thus spoke:—"The peace party throughout the world will raise a crusade against the credit of every government that attempts to carry on an unholy war. Henceforth, let no one talk of Russian resources and Russian money. * * * People talk sometimes as though England and Englishmen were afraid of Russia. I wish to disabuse all minds as to my views on that subject. I do not oppose Russia's advances into Hungary in the belief that, in any possible combination of events, or any accession of territory, Russia can be in the least degree dangerous to England.

Should Russia make an attack upon this country, or another great maritime power, like the United States, it would fall upon her like a thunderbolt, and crumble that empire into its own dreary fastnesses in six months, by the aid of its shipping.—*Speeches in* 1849, *revised by himself.* Mr. Henry Drummond added something to the "crumbling" phrase of Mr. Cobden's, in the debate, in 1855, on the condition of the army before Sebastopol:—"Whatever the honourable member for the West Riding may say, his talk about 'crumpling up' Russia like a sheet of paper ran through the country, and people thought that Russia was a little, foolish, second-rate power, which you had the means of crumpling up whenever you liked."

Voices of the Dead.—On the death of Mr. Cobden, in April, 1865, Mr. Disraeli passed a high eulogium on his character as a politician, and in the course of it remarked: "There is something mournful in the history of this Parliament, when we remember how many of our most eminent and valued public men have passed from among us. I cannot refer to the history of any other Parliament which will bear to posterity so fatal a record. But there is this consolation when we remember these unequalled and irreparable visitations—that these great men are not altogether lost to us; that their opinions will be often quoted in this House, their authority appealed to, their judgments attested; even their very words will form part of our discussions and debates. There are some members of Parliament who, though not present in the body, are still members of this House, independent of dissolutions, of the caprice of constituencies, even of the course of time. I think, sir, Mr. Cobden was one of these men."

SIR EDWARD COKE.

Compliments from the Chair.—Coke, having been elected Speaker of the House of Commons in 1593, was

presented at the bar of the House of Lords, when he disqualified himself to the Queen, saying, "As in the heavens a star is but *opacum corpus* until it have received light from the sun, so stand I *corpus opacum*—a mute body—until your Highness's bright shining wisdom hath looked upon me and allumed me. How unable I am to do this office my present speech doth tell." In his speech at the close of the session he compared Elizabeth to the queen-bee, *sine aculeo.*—*Parliamentary History.*

Reciting a Collect in the House.—After the House had passed the resolution of adjournment from the 4th of June to the 14th of November, 1621, Sir Edward Coke, then upwards of seventy years of age, standing up, with tears in his eyes, recited the Collect for the King and his children, and desired the House to say after him; adding only to it, "and defend them from their cruel enemies."—*Hatsell's "Precedents."*

Parliament and "the King's Word."—On the 1st of May, 1627, Secretary Cooke delivered a message, asking whether they would rely on the *King's word.* This question was followed by a long silence. Several speeches are reported in the letters of the times. Sir Nathaniel Rich observed, that "confident as he was of the royal word, what did any indefinite word ascertain?" Pym said, "We have his Majesty's coronation oath to maintain the laws of England; what need we, then, take his word?" He proposed to move, "Whether we should take the King's word or no." This was resisted by Secretary Cooke: "What would they say in foreign parts, if the people of England would not trust their King?" He desired the House to call Pym to order; on which Pym replied, "Truly, Mr. Speaker, I am just of the same opinion I was—viz., that the King's oath was as powerful as his word." Sir John Elliot moved that it be put to the question, "because they that would have it do urge us to that point." Sir Edward Coke, on

this occasion, made a memorable speech. "We sit now in Parliament, and therefore must take his Majesty's word no otherwise than in a parliamentary way; that is, of a matter agreed on by both Houses—his Majesty sitting on his throne in his robes, with his crown on his head and sceptre in his hand, and in full Parliament; and his royal assent being entered upon record, *in perpetuam rei memoriam.* This was the royal word of a King in Parliament, and not a word delivered in a chamber, and out of the mouth of a secretary, at the second hand; therefore I motion that the House of Commons, *more majorum*, should draw a petition, *de droict*, to his Majesty; which, being confirmed by both Houses, and assented unto by his Majesty, will be as firm an act as any. Not that I distrust the King, but that I cannot take his trust but in a parliamentary way." In this speech of Sir Edward Coke we find the first mention, in the legal style, of the ever-memorable "Petition of Right," which two days after was finished.—*D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature."*

SIR JOHN COVENTRY.

Slitting a Member's Nose.—Burnet, in his "History of his own Time," relates the circumstances connected with the outrage upon Sir John Coventry, and from his narrative the following particulars are taken:—Sir John made a strong reflection on the amours of Charles II., and struggled much in the House against grants of money. Referring to the players, who, it was urged by the Court party, were the King's servants, and a part of his pleasure, Coventry asked whether did the King's pleasure lie among the men or the women that acted? This was carried with great indignation to the Court. Charles accordingly sent some of the guards to watch in the streets where Sir John lodged, and leave a mark on him. Sands, and O'Brian, and some others went thither, and as Coventry was going home

they drew about him. He stood up to the wall and drew the flambeau out of his servant's hand; and with that in the one hand and his sword in the other, he defended himself so well that he got more credit by it than by all the actions of his life. He wounded some of them, but was soon disarmed, and then they cut his nose to the bone. The affair was managed under the orders of the Duke of Monmouth, to whose house the ruffians repaired after performing their task. The House passed a bill of banishment against the perpetrators of it, adding a clause that it should not be in the King's power to pardon them.

OLIVER CROMWELL.*

His Appearance in the House.—The first that ever I took notice of him was in the very beginning of the Parliament held in November, 1640, when I vainly thought myself a courtly young gentleman, for we courtiers valued ourselves much upon our good clothes. I came one morning into the House well clad, and perceived a gentleman speaking, whom I knew not, very ordinarily apparelled, for it was a plain cloth suit, which seemed to have been made by an ill country tailor. His linen was plain, and not very clean; and I remember a speck or two of blood upon his little band, which was not much larger than his collar. His hat was without a hat-band; his stature was of a good size; his sword stuck close to his side, his countenance swoln and reddish, his voice sharp and untunable, and his eloquence full of fervour. For the subject-matter would not bear much of *reason*, it being on behalf of a servant of Mr. Prynne's, who had dispersed libels against the Queen for her dancing, and suchlike innocent and courtly sports; and he aggravated the imprisonment of this man by the council-

* For his dissolution of the Long Parliament, see page 4.

table unto that height that one would have believed the very Government itself had been in great danger by it.—*Sir Philip Warwick's Memoirs.*

The "Sloven."—One day, when Cromwell had spoken warmly in the House, Lord Digby asked Hampden who he was; and Hampden is said to have replied, "That sloven whom you see before you, hath no ornament in his speech; that sloven, I say, if we should ever come to a breach with the King (which God forbid!)—in such a case, I say, that sloven will be the greatest man in England."—*Southey's "Life of Cromwell."*

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN.

His First Constituency in the Irish Parliament.—Lord Longueville, who was the proprietor of the borough of Kilbeggan, returned Curran to the Irish Parliament in 1783, under an idea of his own that a barrister, with a growing family and totally dependent on his profession for subsistence, would scarcely suffer his principles to interfere with his interests. On the very first occasion, however, he not only voted against his patron, but, by at least an energetic speech, proved the total fallacy of all his anticipations. Lord Longueville of course warmly remonstrated; but what was his astonishment to find Curran not only persevering in his independent opinions, but even appropriating the only five hundred pounds he had in the world to the purchase of a seat, which he insisted on transferring as an equivalent for that of Kilbeggan.—*Phillips's "Curran and his Contemporaries."*

A Parenthetical Speech.—Curran was once asked how a member of Parliament had spoken. The answer was, "His speech was a long parenthesis." He was asked to explain. "Why," said he, "don't you know that a parenthesis is a paragraph which may be omitted from

beginning to end, without any loss of meaning?"—*Dr. Croly on Irish Eloquence.*

Airing a Vocabulary.—An able speaker, but addicted to lofty language, had made a speech in the House of Peers, at which Curran was present. He was asked what he thought of the debate. "I had," said he, "only the advantage of hearing Lord —— *airing* his vocabulary."—*Ibid.*

A Ghostly House.—On the union of the Legislatures, the Irish Parliament House was turned into a bank, and various changes took place in the structure; among the rest, the interior was gutted, and the very handsome dome taken down. Curran heard of the remark of a celebrated and facetious lord, that the house looked "like a traitor that had undergone the sentence of the law." Curran, in allusion to that noble lord's activity in carrying the Union, said, "Ay, no man is likelier to make that remark—a murderer is always afraid of ghosts."—*Ibid.*

A Melting Regret.—In an election for the borough of Tallagh, Mr. John Egan, chairman of Kilmainham, an immense sized man, was an unsuccessful candidate. * * * It was in the heat of a very warm summer day, Egan was struggling through the crowd, his handkerchief in one hand, his wig in the other, and his whole countenance raging like the dog-star, when he met Curran. "I'm sorry for you, my dear fellow," said Curran. "Sorry! Why so, Jack—why so? I'm perfectly at ease." "Alas! Egan, 'tis but too visible to every one that you're losing *tallow* (Tallagh) fast." —*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

A Deliberate Aim.—During a debate in the Irish Parliament, August 15th, 1785, on Orde's Commercial Bill, Curran retorted, with severe sarcasm, to a speech of Attorney-General Fitzgibbon, in which he had received a rather gross personal attack. The result of this reply of Mr. Curran was a message from Mr. Fitzgibbon. * * * Mr. Ogle was second to the Attorney-General. The parties

were to fire by signal; Mr. Fitzgibbon did not do so, but, reserving his fire, he took deliberate aim at Curran; and, having missed him, he walked off the ground, without receiving or even asking for an apology, or firing a second time, although he had been the challenger in a case where the object was to obtain satisfaction. Mr. Curran observed to him, "It was not your fault, Mr. Attorney, if you missed me, for you were deliberate enough."—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

THE EARL OF DERBY.

His Manner.—Gladstone's manner, says Professor Pryme, "I never saw excelled except by Lord Derby's, when he was in the House of Commons. The speaking of these two was like a stream pouring forth; or it might be described as if they were reading from a book. I have heard Pitt, Fox, and other great speakers, but never any to equal Lord Derby, when Mr. Stanley, for elegance and sweetness of expression."—*Autobiographic Recollections.*

His First Speech.—Mr. Stanley was three years in the House of Commons before he took part in its debates. His first speech was made in 1824, upon a bill for lighting Manchester with gas. Sir James Mackintosh, who spoke after him, very highly complimented the young member on his performance, and said, "No man could have witnessed with greater satisfaction than himself an accession to the talents of the House which was calculated to give lustre to its character and strengthen its influence; and this was more particularly a subject of satisfaction to him when he reflected that these talents were likely to be employed in supporting principles which he conscientiously believed to be most beneficial to the country."

Parliamentary Instinct.—Macaulay, in his essay on Chatham, thus alludes to the readiness in debate which Mr. Stanley manifested from the first:—"Scarcely any person

has ever become a great debater without long practice and many failures. It was by slow degrees, as Burke said, that Charles Fox became the most brilliant and powerful debater that ever lived. Charles Fox himself attributed his own success to the resolution which he formed when very young, of speaking, well or ill, at least once every night. 'During five whole sessions,' he used to say, 'I spoke every night but one, and I regret only that I did not speak on that night too.' Indeed, with the exception of Mr. Stanley, whose knowledge of the science of parliamentary defence resembles an instinct, it would be difficult to name any eminent debater who has not made himself a master of his art at the expense of his audience."

Raising a Storm.—The Coercion Bill, introduced when Mr. Stanley was Secretary for Ireland, gave occasion for one of the most effective displays of his eloquence. The incident is thus narrated by Earl Russell ("Selections from Speeches," &c.). "It was thought right that Lord Althorp, as the leader of the Government in the House of Commons, should bring in the Bill. He did so in a manner tame and ineffective. His detail of the outrages committed in Ireland was like reading a few of the blackest pages of the 'Newgate Calendar.' The Liberal majority were disappointed, sullen, and ready to break out into mutiny against their chief. Mr. Stanley, who was sitting next to me, greatly annoyed at the aspect of the House, said to me, 'I meant not to have spoken till to-morrow night, but I find I must speak to-night.' He took Lord Althorp's box of official papers, and went upstairs to a room where he could look over them quietly. After the debate had proceeded for two or three hours longer, with no change of temper in the House, Mr. Stanley rose. He explained, with admirable clearness, the insecure and alarming state of Ireland. He then went over, case by case, the more dreadful of the outrages which had been committed. He detailed, with striking

effect, the circumstances attending the murder of a clergyman and the agony of his widow, who, after seeing her husband murdered, had to bear in terror running knocks at the door, kept on all night by the miscreants who had committed the crime. The House became appalled and agitated at the dreadful picture which he placed before their eyes; they felt for the sorrows of the innocent; they were shocked at the dominion of assassins and robbers. When he had produced a thrilling effect by these descriptions he turned upon O'Connell, who led the opposition to the measure, and who seemed a short time before about to achieve a triumph in favour of sedition and anarchy. He recalled to the recollection of the House of Commons that, at a recent public meeting, O'Connell had spoken of the House of Commons as 658 scoundrels. In a tempest of scorn and indignation, he excited the anger of the men thus designated against the author of the calumny. The House, which two hours before seemed about to yield to the great agitator, was now almost ready to tear him to pieces. In the midst of the storm which his eloquence had raised he sat down, having achieved one of the greatest triumphs of eloquence ever won in a popular assembly by the powers of oratory."

A Slip.—We remember (says the writer of a biographical notice in the *Standard*) to have heard Lord Macaulay say that no one ever attempted to catch Lord Stanley tripping, and to interrupt him in his speech, without coming by the worst in the encounter. He might well say so, for he was himself an example of the truth of his words. On one occasion, in the full rush and torrent of his eloquence, Lord Stanley used the expression "mutually suicidal." It was, perhaps, not strictly defensible, and the slip was too much for the "book in breeches," who was then sitting on the front bench in opposition, to pass over. Half rising from his seat, and removing his hat with well-affected courtesy, he repeated the words in an inquiring

tone, "Mutually suicidal?" Lord Stanley checked himself for an instant, looked his antagonist full in the face, and, without attempting to justify the expression, contemptuously replied, "The right honourable gentleman is a great verbal critic." The cheers of the House showed the retort had told.

"The Rupert of Debate."—This well-known epithet was applied to Lord Stanley by Lord Lytton in his early poem, "The New Timon." The following is the passage in which it occurs:—

> "The brilliant chief, irregularly great,
> Frank, haughty, rash—the Rupert of Debate!
> Nor gout nor toil his freshness can destroy,
> And time still leaves all Eton in the boy.
> First in the class and keenest in the ring,
> He saps like Gladstone and he fights like Spring.
> Ev'n at the feast his pluck pervades the board,
> And dauntless gamecocks symbolise their lord.
> Lo where atilt at friend—if barred from foe—
> He scours the ground and volunteers the blow,
> And, tired with conquest over Dan and Snob,
> Plants a sly bruiser on the nose of Bob;
> Decorous Bob, too friendly to reprove,
> Suggests fresh fighting in the next remove,
> And prompts his chum, in hopes the vein to cool,
> To the prim benches of the upper school.
> Yet who not listens with delighted smile
> To the pure Saxon of that silver style?
> In the clear style a heart as clear is seen,
> Prompt to the rash—revolting from the mean."

The Democratic Tide.—It was often imputed to the Earl of Derby that he had said he considered it his mission to "stem the tide of democracy." The exact phrase did not proceed from his own mouth, but it originated in a passage of a speech he delivered in the House of Lords on the 15th of March, 1852. Replying to a question from Lord Beaumont as to the intentions of the new Government with respect to duties on corn, Earl Derby (according to "Hansard") said, "We are threatened with far more serious

consequences than could result from the imposition of a 4s., 5s., or 7s. duty on foreign corn. The question before us is, whether the Government of this country can be carried on, and as to the principles on which it is to be carried on. And when I appeal to the country it will be on these grounds: Will you, Protectionists and Free Traders, all you who desire the advantage of all the interests of the country, place your confidence in, and give your support to, a Government which, in the hour of peril, did not hesitate to take the post of danger when the helmsman had left the helm? Will you support a Government which is exerting itself to protect the country against any hostile attack, to maintain the peace of the world, to maintain and uphold the Protestant institutions of the country, to give, to the utmost of its power, religious and moral education throughout the land; and which will exert itself moreover, I don't hesitate to say, to stem with some opposition, to supply some barrier against the current of that continually increasing and encroaching democratic influence in this nation, which is bent on throwing the whole power and authority of the Government nominally into the hands of the masses, but practically and really into those of demagogues and republicans, who exercise an influence over those unthinking masses—will you, I say, support a Government which is determined to resist that noxious and dangerous influence, and to preserve inviolate the prerogatives of the Crown, the rights of your lordships' House, and the liberties of a freely-elected and freely-represented House of Commons? These, my lords, are the questions on which, when I go to the country, I make my appeal, on behalf of myself and of my colleagues; and, in the words which are placed in the mouths of the meanest felons that stand in the prisoner's dock, but which are not unworthy of the mouth of the first minister of the first country in the world, I say, 'I elect that we shall be tried by God and our country.'"

The "Leap in the Dark."—On the third reading of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords, August 6th, 1867, the Earl of Derby said, "No doubt we are making a great experiment and 'taking a leap in the dark,' but I have the greatest confidence in the sound sense of my fellow countrymen, and I entertain a strong hope that the extended franchise which we are now conferring upon them will be the means of placing the institutions of this country on a firmer basis, and that the passing of the measure will tend to increase the loyalty and contentment of a great portion of her Majesty's subjects."—*Hansard.*

MR. DISRAELI.

His First Appearance.—Mr. Disraeli was first returned to Parliament in 1837, as representative of Maidstone, and delivered his maiden speech on the 7th of December in that year, on Irish election petitions. He was heard with continual interruptions, but concluded with a prophecy which has become famous. The following was his peroration, as given in "Hansard":—"Nothing was so easy as to laugh. He wished before he sat down to show the House clearly their position. When they remembered that, in spite of the support of the hon. and learned member for Dublin (Mr. O'Connell) and his well-disciplined band of patriots, there was a little shyness exhibited by former supporters of her Majesty's Government—when they recollected the 'new loves' and the 'old loves' in which so much of passion and recrimination was mixed up between the noble Tityrus of the Treasury bench and the learned Daphne of Liskeard (loud laughter)—notwithstanding the *amantium iræ* had resulted, as he had always expected, in the *amoris integratio* (renewed laughter)—notwithstanding that political duel had been fought, in which more than one shot was interchanged, but in which recourse was had to the secure

arbitrament of blank cartridges (laughter)—notwithstanding emancipated Ireland and enslaved England, the noble lord might wave in one hand the keys of St. Peter, and in the other—(the shouts that followed drowned the conclusion of the sentence). 'Let them see the philosophical prejudice of man.' He would certainly gladly hear a cheer, even though it came from the lips of a political opponent. He was not at all surprised at the reception which he had experienced. He had begun several times many things, and he had often succeeded at last. He would sit down now, but the time would come when they would hear him."

The Whigs caught Bathing.—It was in a debate on the opening of letters at the Post Office, in 1845, that Mr. Disraeli used this celebrated illustration of the tactics of Sir Robert Peel. He said, "I know there are some who think that he is looking out for new allies. I never believed anything of the kind. The position of the right hon. gentleman is clear and precise. I do not believe he is looking to any coalition, although many of my constituents do. The right hon. gentleman has only exactly to remain where he is. The right hon. gentleman caught the Whigs bathing and walked away with their clothes. He has left them in the full enjoyment of their liberal position, and he is himself a strict conservative of their garments."—*Hansard.*

"Tea-Kettle Precedents."—When Sir Robert Peel introduced the Bill for the increased grant to Maynooth, he rested his arguments less upon any broad scheme of policy which might have compromised him directly with powerful parties, than upon the fact that the principle had been sanctioned, though obscurely, by parliamentary authority. This gave occasion to Mr. Disraeli to make a hit at the Premier, which was at once humorous and true. He said that with him great measures were always rested on small precedents; that he always traced the steam-engine back to

the tea-kettle; that, in fact, all his precedents were "tea-kettle precedents."—*Francis's "Critical Biography of Disraeli."*

Heedless Rhetoric.—During the debate on the Irish Church in 1868, Mr. Disraeli was often taunted with arguments he had used in a speech on the state of Ireland in 1844. He said, in one of his replies: "I have been reminded in the course of this debate of expressions which I used five-and-twenty years ago. I could remind other gentlemen of expressions they used on the same subject five-and-twenty years ago; but I do not much care for that sort of thing. With reference, however, to that passage which has been quoted from a speech made by me, I may remark that it appeared to me at the time I made it that nobody listened to it. It seemed to me that I was pouring water upon sand, but it seems now that the water came from a golden goblet. With regard to the passage from that speech, there are many remarks which, if I wanted to vindicate or defend myself, I might legitimately make. * * * All this I might say; but I do not care to say it, and I do not wish to say it, because in my conscience the sentiment of that speech was right. It may have been expressed with the heedless rhetoric which I suppose is the appanage of all who sit below the gangway; but in my historical conscience the sentiment of that speech was right."—*Hansard.*

An Appeal to the Jury.—In the debate on Mr. Gladstone's Irish Church resolutions, in April, 1868, Mr. Disraeli said:—"The only objection which I have to the attacks of the noble lord (Cranborne) is that they invariably produce an echo from the other side. When the bark is heard from this side, the right hon. member for Calne emerges, I will not say from his cave,* but perhaps

* The Cave of Adullam—see page 64.

from a more cynical habitation. He joins immediately in the chorus of reciprocal malignity—

'And hails with horrid melody the moon.'

*, * * The right hon. gentleman was extremely exuberant in his comments upon my character and career. I will not trouble the House with a defence of that character and career. I have lived in this House more than thirty years, and can truly say that during that time comments upon my character and career have been tolerably free and plain. But the House has been the jury of my life, and it allows me now here to address it, and therefore here is not the place in which I think it necessary to vindicate myself."

THOMAS SLINGSBY DUNCOMBE.

Persevering Bribery.—Mr. Duncombe first stood a contest for Pontefract in 1821; took an enormous deal of trouble in canvassing, and spent much money in bribery, but was unsuccessful. In 1823 he was again in the field as a parliamentary candidate, and ventured to contest a family borough (Hertford) with its proprietor. He again failed, after spending much money. In the general election of 1826, Hertford was again canvassed by him in opposition to Mr. Henry Bulwer, who was then commencing his political career. There were three claimants for the suffrages of the electors; the borough returned two, and the fight was for the second place. Mr. Duncombe having bribed handsomely secured a majority.—"*Life*," *by his Son.*

Maintaining his Point.—In August, 1831, Mr. Goulburn brought an accusation against Lord Durham for interfering in an election. Mr. Duncombe pronounced it "a base and wicked calumny." There was a tremendous call of "Chair!" and the chairman administered a mild

remonstrance, saying that in Mr. Duncombe's calmer and more sober moments he would not use such terms. The latter answered, undauntedly, "I am quite calm, and sober enough, and mean what I say." Down upon him came Sir Robert Peel, Sir Henry Hardinge, Sir Henry Inglis; down upon him came the parliamentary magnates from both sides of the House, threatening, advising, and insisting on an explanation; but the bold reformer heeded not the menaces, cared not for the advice, and openly declared that he had spoken the truth, and meant to maintain it. His firmness conquered his opponents, and Mr. Goulburn pocketed the affront.—*Ibid.*

An Equivocal Compliment.—On one occasion Mr. Duncombe received a present from a Leeds clothier, a political admirer, accompanied by the following note:—"Briggate, Leeds, July 6th, 1842. Sir,—I take the liberty of sending you a trowsers piece, three yards in length, made from 'devil's dust' and 'cotton.' If you think it is not suitable wear for a gentleman, be kind enough to hand it to Mr. Busfield Ferrand, as a reward for his enormous lying. I can supply you with any quantity at fourpence-halfpenny per yard. There are thousands of persons in this town who admire your honest and independent conduct, and only regret that you are not better supported in the House.—I remain your obedient servant, Wm. Whitehead."—*Ibid.*

LORD ELDON.

His First Election Speech.—Mr. Scott (afterwards Lord Eldon) put up for Weobly in June, 1783, and being returned, took his seat for the first time as representative of that borough. He says he delivered his speech to the crowd from the top of a heap of stones. "My audience liked the speech, and I ended, as I had begun, by kissing the prettiest

girl in the place—very pleasant, indeed."—*Campbell's "Lives."*

Receiving the Great Seals.—On the 14th April, 1801, the King handed over the Great Seals to Lord Eldon. "I do not know," he says, referring to this circumstance, "what made George III. so fond of me, but he was fond of me. When I went to him for the seals, he had his coat buttoned at the lower part, and putting his right hand within, he drew them out from the left side, saying, 'I give them to you from my heart.'"—*Wills's "Lord Eldon."*

Tailors and Turncoats.—While the Catholic Relief Bill was making progress in the House of Commons, there were, from the commencement of the session, nightly skirmishes in the House of Lords on the presentation of petitions for and against the measure. The Chancellor (Lyndhurst, who had changed sides on the question) sometimes mixed in these, and received painful scratches. Lord Eldon presenting an Anti-Catholic petition from the Company of Tailors at Glasgow, the Chancellor, still sitting on the woolsack, said, in a stage whisper, loud enough to be heard in the galleries: "What! do tailors trouble themselves with such *measures?*" Lord Eldon: "My noble and learned friend might have been aware that tailors cannot like *turncoats.*" (A loud laugh.)—*Campbell's "Life of Lyndhurst."*

Consistency.—When Lord Encombe, Lord Eldon's grandson, received his doctor's degree at the hands of the Duke of Wellington—then Chancellor of the University of Oxford—Lord Eldon was present as High Steward, and was treated with great respect and attention. He himself relates the following anecdote:—"What charmed me very much when I left the theatre, and was trying to get to my carriage, was: one man in the crowd shouted out, 'Here's old Eldon! Cheer him; for he never ratted!' I was very much delighted, for I never did rat. I will not say I have been right through

life. I may have been wrong; but I will say that I have been consistent."—*Wills's "Lord Eldon."*

ELWES, THE MISER.

Unwigging a Member.—Elwes, who had a seat in Parliament, wore a wig; it looked as if it might have been picked off a hedge or a scare-crow. At that time we used to wear dress swords occasionally at the House; for instance, if going to the opera. One day, Bankes, whose carriage is stiff and lofty, had on his sword, and was seated next to Elwes, who leant his head forward just as Bankes was rising up to leave his place, when the hilt of his sword came in contact with Elwes' wig, which it whisked off and bore away. The House was instantly in a roar of laughter. I never shall forget the scene. There was old Elwes, without his wig, darting forward to reclaim it; and Bankes marching on quite unconscious of the sword-knot which he wore, and wondering what the laugh was about.—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

LORD ERSKINE.

His Maiden Speech and Parliamentary Failure.—Erskine was returned to Parliament for Portsmouth, November 20th, 1783, and delivered his maiden speech on Fox's India Bill. Pitt sat, evidently intending to reply, with pen and paper in his hand, prepared to catch the arguments of this formidable adversary. He wrote a word or two. Erskine proceeded; but with every additional sentence Pitt's attention to the paper relaxed, his look became more careless, and he obviously began to think the orator less and less worthy of his attention. At length, when every eye in the house was fixed upon him, with a contemptuous smile he dashed the pen through the paper, and flung them on the floor. Erskine never recovered from this expression of dis-

dain. His voice faltered, he struggled through the remainder of his speech, and sank into his seat dispirited, and shorn of his fame.—*Croly's "Life of George IV."* Sir N. Wraxall says of this speech: "Erskine's enemies pronounced the performance tame, and destitute of the animation which so powerfully characterised his speeches in Westminster Hall. They maintained that, however resplendent he appeared as an advocate while addressing a jury, he fell to the level of an ordinary man, if not below it, when seated on the ministerial bench, where another species of oratory was demanded to impress conviction or to extort admiration. To me, who, having never witnessed his jurisprudential talents, could not make any such comparison, he appeared to exhibit shining powers of declamation." Lord Byron said of Erskine's parliamentary oratory: "I don't know what Erskine may have been at the *bar*, but in the House I wish him at the bar once more." Butler, in his "Reminiscences," relates that, Fox having made an able speech, Mr. Erskine followed him with one of the very same import. Pitt rose to answer them. He announced his intention to reply to both. "But," said he, "I shall make no mention of what was said by the honourable gentleman who spoke last; he did no more than regularly repeat what was said by the member who preceded him, and regularly weaken all he repeated."

Defence of Liberty.—During the session of 1795-96 Mr. Erskine distinguished himself in Parliament by his strenuous opposition to two measures, which were, as he conceived, directed against the liberty of the subject. Upon the first of these (the Seditious Meetings Bill) he spoke with an energy and boldness not often exhibited within the walls of Parliament. "'If the King's ministers,'" said he, adopting the words of Lord Chatham, "'will not admit a constitutional question to be decided on according to the forms and on the principles of the constitution, it must then

be decided in some other manner; and rather than that it should be given up—rather than the nation should surrender their birthright to a despotic minister—I hope, my lords, old as I am, I shall see the question brought to issue, and fairly tried between the people and the Government.' With the sanction of the sentiments of the venerable and illustrious Earl of Chatham, I will maintain that the people of England should defend their rights, if necessary, by the last extremity to which free men can resort. For my own part, I shall never cease to struggle in support of liberty. In no situation will I desert the cause. I was born a free man, and, by God, I will never die a slave!"—*Roscoe's "Eminent British Lawyers."*

Whitebait and Seal.—When Erskine was Chancellor, being asked by the Secretary to the Treasury whether he would attend the ministerial fish dinner to be given at Greenwich, at the end of the session, he answered, "To be sure I will; what would your fish dinner be without the Great Seal?"—*Campbell's "Lives."*

LORD FALKLAND.

His Saying about Bishops.—When Sir Edward Dering's bill "for the extirpation of episcopacy" was under discussion in committee, in 1641, as the proceedings were protracted from day to day, the House began to lose interest in the matter, and the attendance of members consequently fell off; "they only who prosecuted the bill with impatience remaining in the House," says Clarendon, in his "History," "and the others who abhorred it, growing weary of so tiresome an attendance, left the House at dinner time, and afterwards followed their pleasures; so that the Lord Falkland was wont to say, 'that they who hated bishops hated them worse than the devil, and that they who loved them did not love them so well as their dinner.'"

HENRY FLOOD.

Retaliation.—Courtenay silenced Flood in the English House by a crushing reply to a hasty *début* of the rival of Grattan in Ireland. I asked Courtenay (for I like to trace motives) if he had not some personal provocation; for the acrimony of his answer seemed to me, as I read it, to involve it. Courtenay said "he had; that, when in Ireland (being an Irishman), at the bar of the Irish House of Commons, Flood had made a personal and unfair attack upon himself, who, not being a member of that House, could not defend himself; and that some years afterwards the opportunity of retort offering in the English Parliament, he could not resist it." He certainly repaid Flood with interest, for Flood never made any figure, and only made a speech or two afterwards, in the English House of Commons. I must except, however, his speech on reform, in 1790, which Fox called "the best speech he ever heard upon that subject."—*Byron* (*Moore's "Life"*).

A Wooden Oracle.—One of Flood's methods of "disquieting" a minister was the plying him with inconvenient questions. On one of these occasions (in the Irish Parliament) the Secretary referred him to some subaltern who was absent. "Well, well," said he, "I must be content to wait. Formerly the oak of Dodona uttered its own oracles, but the wooden oracle of our Treasury is compelled to give his responses by deputy."—*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

Whipping the "Whip."—Flood once thus ludicrously affrighted the luckless "Whipper-in" of the Irish House, as he crossed him during his speech. "What is that I see? Shall the Temple of Freedom be still haunted by the foul fiend of bribery and corruption? I see personified before me an incarnation of that evil principle which lives by the destruction of public virtue."—*Ibid.*

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

Fox and Pitt in Childhood.—In 1767, Lady Holland, mother of Fox, paid a visit to Lady Chatham, of which she gave the following account to her husband:—"I have been this morning with Lady Hester Pitt; and there is little William Pitt, now eight years old, and really the cleverest child I ever saw, and brought up so strictly and so proper in his behaviour that—mark my words—that little boy will be a thorn in Charles's side as long as he lives." A very singular prediction, showing not only the early cleverness of the two boys, but the cherished ambition of their parents, the wise strictness of Lord and Lady Chatham, and the sagacity of Lady Holland.—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

First Appearance of Fox in Parliament, and his Early Speeches.—Charles Fox was returned for Midhurst in May, 1768, when he was only nineteen years and four months old. He took his seat in the following November.* He made his first speech in the House of Commons on the 9th of March, 1769, when he was little more than twenty years of age. It seems to have been on a point of order—a singular topic for so young a man. * * * On the 8th of May he spoke against the petition of the electors of Middlesex in favour of their right of electing Wilkes. Of this speech Horace Walpole observes: "Charles Fox, not yet twenty-one, answered Burke with great quickness and parts, but with confidence equally premature." Sir Richard Heron, in a letter to Sir Charles Bunbury, says: "Mr. Charles Fox, who, I suppose was your schoolfellow, and who is but twenty, made a great figure last night upon the petition of the Middlesex freeholders. He spoke with great spirit, in very parliamentary language, and entered very

* S. Rogers mentions, on Fox's authority, that he was abroad at the time of his election.

deeply into the question on constitutional principle." Lord Holland, proud of his favourite boy, writes thus to his friend Mr. Campbell, of Cawdor: "I am told (and willingly believe it) Charles Fox spoke extremely well. It was all off-hand, all argumentative, in reply to Mr. Burke and Mr. Wedderburne, and excessively well indeed. I hear it spoke of by everybody as a most extraordinary thing, and I am, you see, not a little pleased with it. I am told Charles can never make a better speech than he did on Monday."—*Ibid.* Horace Walpole writes to Sir Horace Mann in April, 1772:—"I went to the House of Commons the other day to hear Charles Fox, contrary to a resolution I had made never to set my foot there again. It is strange how disuse makes one awkward; I felt a palpitation, as if I were going to speak there myself. The object answered: Fox's abilities are amazing at so very early a period, especially under the circumstances of such a dissolute life. He was just arrived from Newmarket, had sat up drinking all night, and had not been in bed. How such talents make one laugh at Tully's rules for an orator, and his indefatigable application. His laboured orations are puerile in comparison of this boy's manly reason."

The Artist's Sketch.—Lord Holland relates the following apropos of the personal appearance of Fox:—"I have in my possession a singular proof of the figure and impression Mr. Fox made on his first appearance as an orator. A young artist, and I believe a reporter of debates, a Mr. Surtees, of Mainforth, happened to be in the gallery when he first spoke. At that period no stranger was allowed to make notes, or take any paper or note-book into the gallery for that purpose. But this gentleman, struck with the appearance of the youthful orator, tore off part of his shirt, and sketched on it, with a pencil or burnt stick, a likeness of him, which he afterwards tried to finish at his

lodgings, and which, owing to the care of Mr. Sharpe and kindness of Mr. Fletcher, is still preserved in my possession at Holland House, retaining many traits of resemblance to the dark, intelligent, and animated features of Mr. Fox."

Characteristics of his Speeches.—Conversation Sharpe relates of Mr. Fox that he sometimes put the arguments of his adversaries in such an advantageous light that his friends were alarmed lest he should fail to answer them. To state one by one the arguments of the Opposition, and one by one to reply to them, was the characteristic of his speaking, and without the aid of this text upon which to hang his comments he could make little progress. His opening speeches were almost always bad. Until he got warmed with his subject he hesitated and stammered, and he often continued for long together in a tame and commonplace strain. Even in his highest flights he indulged in incessant repetitions, was negligent in his language, and was neither polished nor exact in his style. Notwithstanding these defects, he exercised a prodigious influence over his hearers. "He forgot himself," says Sir James Mackintosh, "and everything around him. He darted fire into his audience. Torrents of impetuous and irresistible eloquence swept along their feelings and convictions."—*Quarterly Review.*

The Magician's Wand.—A French gentleman expressed some surprise at the immense influence which Fox, a man of pleasure, ruined by the dice-box and the turf, exercised over the English nation. "You have not," said Pitt, "been under the wand of the magician."—*Macaulay's "Biography of Pitt."*

Quelling Interruption.—But for the inferiority of the subject, the speech upon the Westminster scrutiny, in 1784, might perhaps be placed at the head of all his speeches. * * * A fortunate cry of "Order!" which he early raised in the very exordium, by affirming that "far

from expecting any indulgence, he could scarcely hope for bare justice from the House," gave him occasion for dwelling on this topic, and pressing it home with additional illustration; till the redoubled blows and repeated bursts of extemporaneous declamation almost overpowered the audience, while they wholly bore down any further interruption.—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

The Sovereign People.—In the beginning of May, 1798, the Duke of Norfolk presided at a great dinner of the Whig Club. At the close of the evening he gave as a toast, "Our Sovereign—the People;" or, as Lord Holland relates it, "The People—our Sovereign." Upon the report of these doings he was dismissed by the Crown from the Lord Lieutenancy of the West Riding of Yorkshire. Fox, glad to defend what he considered the true doctrine, went afterwards to the Whig Club, and gave the same toast which had caused so much offence in the mouth of the Duke of Norfolk. For this Pitt struck his name out of the Privy Council.—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

The Commons not a Place of Much Importance.—When Mr. Grey's father, Sir Charles Grey, was made a peer, Fox wrote thus to Mr. Grey:—"I am very much concerned, indeed, to hear of your father's peerage, more especially as I understand it vexes you very much. It is undoubtedly a provoking event; but, according to my notions, the constitution of the country is declining so rapidly, that the House of Commons has in a great measure ceased, and will shortly entirely cease, to be a place of much importance."—*Fox's Correspondence.*

Foxiana.—The following facts respecting Fox are given in S. Rogers' "Recollections":—Lord Grenville said, "his speeches were full of repetitions. He used to say that it was necessary to *hammer it into them;* but I rather think he could not do otherwise." Lord Holland related that when he first entered office, being dissatisfied with his handwriting,

he took lessons. George III. (said the Duke of Wellington) was no listener. When Fox came out of the closet once, somebody said, "You have had a long audience." "Given one, you mean," was his answer.

Grattan's Character of Fox.—His name excites tenderness and wonder. To do justice to that immortal person, you must not limit your view to his country. His genius was not confined to England; it was seen three thousand miles off, in communicating freedom to the Americans; it was visible I know not how far off, in ameliorating the condition of the Indian; it was discernible on the coast of Africa, in accomplishing the abolition of the slave trade. You are to measure the magnitude of his mind by parallels of latitude. His heart was as soft as that of a woman; his intellect was adamant.—*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

Duel between Fox and Mr. Adam.—Mr. Fox had made a vehement attack on Mr. Adam, who had changed from the Opposition to the Ministerial side, and had given as a reason for his change that, although the ministers were not very competent, no persons more competent were to be found among their opponents. Mr. Fox, confounding mental power with moral rectitude, described the minister as turning round on his new defender, and saying to him, "Begone, begone, wretch! who delightest in libelling mankind, confounding virtue and vice, and insulting the man whom thou pretendest to defend, by saying to his face that he certainly is infamous, but that there are others still more so." Mr. Adam having in vain endeavoured to obtain an explanation of this speech from Mr. Fox, to be inserted in the newspapers, sent Major Humberston to arrange the particulars of a hostile meeting. The meeting accordingly took place in Hyde Park, at eight o'clock in the morning of the 29th of November. After the ground had been measured, Mr. Adam desired Mr. Fox to fire; to which Mr. Fox replied, "Sir, I have no

quarrel with you, do you fire." Mr. Adam fired; Mr. Fox then fired without effect. Upon this the seconds, Colonel Fitzpatrick and Major Humberston, interfered, asking Mr. Adam if he was satisfied. Mr. Adam replied, "Will Mr. Fox declare he meant no personal attack upon my character?" Upon which Mr. Fox said, "This was no place for apologies," and desired Mr. Adam to go on. Mr. Adam fired his second pistol without effect. Mr. Fox fired his remaining pistol in the air, and said that, as the affair was ended, he had no difficulty in declaring he meant no more personal affront to Mr. Adam than he did to either of the other gentlemen present. Mr. Adam replied, "Sir, you have behaved like a man of honour." Mr. Fox then mentioned that he believed himself wounded. On opening his waistcoat, it was found that Mr. Adam's first ball had taken effect, but that the wound was very slight. The wits of Opposition said that Mr. Adam had used Government powder, notorious for being deficient in strength. No men were greater friends in after life than Mr. Fox and Mr. Adam.—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

THE RIVALS AT PEACE.—The graves of Fox and Pitt, in Westminster Abbey, are situated within a few inches of each other. Sir Walter Scott thus moralises on the fact, in the introduction to the first canto of "Marmion":—

"Where—taming thought to human pride!—
The mighty chiefs sleep side by side.
Drop upon Fox's grave the tear,
'Twill trickle to his rival's bier;
O'er Pitt's the mournful requiem sound,
And Fox's shall the notes rebound.
The solemn echo seems to cry—
'Here let their discord with them die;
Speak not for those a separate doom,
Whom fate made brothers in the tomb;
But, search the land of living men,
Where wilt thou find their like agen?'"

SIR PHILIP FRANCIS.

An Unready Man.—As a speaker, Francis was unsuccessful. His own theory on the subject is given by Lady Francis in her "Reminiscences." "Here I may account for his not being a ready speaker in Parliament, except when roused by indignation or feeling, when he electrified the House. He accounted for it from Lord Bacon's well-known axiom: 'Reading makes a full man, writing makes an exact man, speaking makes a ready man.' 'I had enough and too much of the former, and none of the latter, in my youth. A vessel may be too full to part easily with its contents, and few orators are very exact men; besides, I had too much sensibility, and felt the House was against me. The House was Pitt's, and Pitt could not despise me, but he tried to make it believe he did.'" Lady Francis adds another reason for his hesitation in speaking—namely, that extreme anxiety to maintain his secret made him weigh every word lest it should convict him of being "Junius."

EDWARD GIBBON.

A Mute Member.—The historian of the Roman Empire was returned for Liskeard in 1774, and sat in Parliament for eight sessions. Prudence, he says in his "Autobiography," condemned him to acquiesce in the humble station of a mute. "Timidity was fortified by pride, and even the success of my pen discouraged the trial of my voice." In a letter to a friend he writes, "I am still a mute: it is more tremendous than I imagined; the great speakers fill me with despair, the bad ones with terror." Gibbon supported Lord North's administration by his vote, and was appointed one of the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. He was employed by the Government, at the outbreak of hostilities

with France in 1778, to draw up the official manifesto on that occasion.

A Contrast.—In a letter to a friend in 1783, describing his life at Lausanne, the ex-M.P. says: "Acknowledge that such a life is more conducive to happiness than five nights in the week passed in the House of Commons, or five mornings spent at the Custom House." But in his "Autobiography" he remarks, "I never found my mind more vigorous, nor my composition more happy, than in the winter hurry of society and Parliament."

His Application for Diplomatic Employment.—The following letter is given in Gibbon's "Autobiography and Correspondence." The communication is without date, nor does the name of the nobleman to whom it was addressed appear: "My Lord,—I am ignorant (as I ought to be) of the present state of our negotiations for peace; I am likewise ignorant how far I may appear qualified to co-operate in this important and salutary work. If, from any advantages of language or local connections, your lordship should think my services might be usefully employed, particularly in any future intercourse with the Court of France, permit me to say that my love of ease and literary leisure shall never stand in competition with the obligations of duty and gratitude which I owe to his Majesty's Government." Gibbon also applied to Lord Thurlow, soliciting an appointment as Secretary to the Embassy to Paris, in 1783. Of the result he writes: "The scheme is completely vanished, and I support the disappointment with heroic patience."

MR. GLADSTONE.

A School for Statesmen.—In a speech on Lord Derby's Reform Bill, March 29th, 1859, Mr. Gladstone asked, "Is it not, under Providence, to be attributed to a

succession of distinguished statesmen, introduced at an early age into this House, and once made known in this House securing to themselves the general favour of their countrymen, that we enjoy our present extension of popular liberty, and, above all, the durable form which that liberty has assumed?"—*Hansard.*

Irish Church Disestablishment.—The first clear intimation of Mr. Gladstone's policy with respect to the Irish Church took Parliament and the country by surprise. It occurred in a debate on the state of Ireland, introduced by an independent member (Mr. Maguire), March 16th, 1868; Mr. Disraeli's Government then being in office. After speaking at some length on the various grievances of which Ireland complained, and of the Church Establishment among them, Mr. Gladstone referred to his former speeches on the subject, and said: "I did not use one word, to my knowledge, which was contrary to the opinion I held then and hold now—namely, that in order to the settlement of the question of the Irish Church, that Church, as a State Church, must cease to exist. * * * Without the slightest reproach to any of those who bear office in the Irish Church, I am convinced, from a long observation, that that institution is, and by the law of its existence must be, the home and last refuge of the spirit of ascendancy; and as that which, beyond all particular and special measures, we need, is the expulsion of the spirit of ascendancy from Ireland, I take leave to say that, in order to that expulsion, we must now proceed to deal decisively with that question of the Irish Church." He further remarked, "My opinion is that religious equality is a phrase that requires further development, and I will develop it further by saying that, in this religious equality in Ireland, I, for my part, include in its fullest extent the word—a very grave word, I do not deny, and I think we cannot be too careful to estimate its gravity before we come to a final conclusion—the very grave word disestablishment.

If we are to do any good at all by meddling with the Church in Ireland, it must, in my judgment, be by putting an end to its existence as a State Church."—*Ibid.* With reference to the unexpected character of this announcement, Mr. Disraeli remarked, in the debate upon going into committee upon Mr. Gladstone's resolutions (April 3rd, 1868), that the right honourable gentleman had come forward "all of a sudden, like a thief in the night."

Use of Quotation.—Mr. Gladstone's frequent and skilful use of quotation in debate is well known; but quotation probably never took a wider range in a brief compass, or was more effective, than in the following passage of his speech on moving his Irish Church resolutions, March 30th, 1868:—"There are many who think that to lay hands upon the National Church Establishment of a country is a profane and unhallowed act. I respect that feeling. I sympathise with it. I sympathise with it while I think it my duty to overcome and repress it. But if it be an error, it is an error entitled to respect. There is something in the idea of a National Establishment of religion, of a solemn appropriation of a part of the commonwealth, for conferring upon all who are ready to receive it what we know to be an inestimable benefit; of saving that portion of the inheritance from private selfishness, in order to extract from it, if we can, pure and unmixed advantages of the highest order for the population at large—there is something in this so attractive, that it is an image that must always command the homage of the many. It is somewhat like the kingly ghost in *Hamlet*, of which one of the characters of Shakespeare says—

> 'We do it wrong, being so majestical,
> To offer it the show of violence;
> For it is, as the air, invulnerable,
> And our vain blows malicious mockery.'

But, sir, this is to view a religious Establishment upon one side, only upon what I may call the ethereal side. It has

likewise a side of earth; and here I cannot do better than quote some lines written by the present Archbishop of Dublin at a time when his genius was devoted to the Muses. He said, in speaking of mankind—

> 'We who did our lineage high
> Draw from beyond the starry sky,
> Are yet upon the other side
> To earth and to its dust allied.'

And so the Church Establishment, regarded in its theory and in its aim, is beautiful and attractive. Yet what is it but an appropriation of public property, an appropriation of the fruits of labour and of skill to certain purposes? and unless those purposes be fulfilled, that appropriation cannot be justified. Therefore, sir, I cannot but feel that we must set aside fears which thrust themselves upon the imagination, and act upon the sober dictates of our judgment. I think it has been shown that the cause for action is strong—not for precipitate action, not for action beyond our powers, but for such action as the opportunities of the times and the condition of Parliament, if there be but a ready will, will amply and easily admit of. If I am asked as to my expectations of the issue of this struggle, I begin by frankly avowing that I, for one, would not have entered into it unless I believed that the final hour was about to sound.

> '*Venit summa dies et ineluctabile fatum.*' "

—*Hansard.*

A Minister's Duty.—"It is the duty of a Minister to stand like a wall of adamant between the people and the Sovereign."—*Speech at Garston, Nov. 14th*, 1868.

The Lords "in a Balloon."—This saying was applied freely to the Upper House in 1869, in consequence of an expression made use of by Mr. Gladstone in the discussion of the Lords' amendments to the Irish Church Bill. The following is the *Times*' report of the passage:—"The right

hon. gentleman says truly that we ought to approach in a spirit of respect the amendments made by the House of Lords. As I come to discuss them I shall endeavour, and my colleagues will do the same, to conform to that rule. We can hardly expect of the House of Lords that they should appreciate the humble considerations which govern the special relations between each member of Parliament and the portion of the British people that he represents. From the great eminence on which they sit they can no more discuss the minute particulars of our transactions than could a man in a balloon. Had the House of Lords gone through the experience of such an election as the last, it would be absolutely impossible for them, as honourable politicians, to have consented to the clause [in favour of "concurrent endowment"] which they have put into this bill."

A Generous Compliment.—Mr. Gladstone's readiness to encourage young and promising members of the House of Commons has often been displayed. A striking instance occurred in committee on the Irish Church Bill, April 29th, 1869. Mr. Chaplin, one of the representatives of Lincolnshire, had made an able first speech against the policy of the Government, and the Premier, rising immediately after, thus complimented him:—"The hon. member who has just sat down has admonished us, and myself in particular, that the sense of justice is apt to grow dull under the influence of a long parliamentary experience. But there is one sentiment which I can assure him does not grow dull under the influence of a long parliamentary experience, and that is the sense of pleasure when I hear—whether upon these benches or upon those opposite to me—an able, and at the same time frank, ingenuous, and manly statement of opinion, and one of such a character as to show me that the man who makes it is a real addition to the intellectual and moral worth and strength of Parliament. Having said this, I express my thanks to the hon. member for having sharply

challenged us; it is right that we should be so challenged, and we do not shrink from it."

LORD GEORGE GORDON

The No Popery Riots.—In the session of 1779 an Act had been passed for the relief of the Roman Catholics, a measure which induced the formation of the Protestant Association, with Lord George Gordon as its president. On Monday, May 29th, 1780, says the *Annual Register*, a meeting was held at Coachmakers' Hall, when it was resolved, "That the whole body of the Protestant Association do attend in St. George's Fields on Friday next, at ten o'clock in the morning, to accompany his lordship to the House of Commons, on the delivery of the Protestant petition." Accordingly, on the day appointed, many thousands assembled at the place of meeting and marched in procession to Westminster, preceded by those who bore the petition against the Catholic Relief Bill. About half-past two they arrived before the Houses of Parliament, when they gave a general shout. Members, as they arrived, were subjected to gross outrage and personal violence. Almost all were compelled to put blue cockades in their hats and call out "No Popery!" whilst some were forced to take oaths to vote for the repeal of the obnoxious law. While the mob were venting their fury on peers and commoners alike, their leader harangued them from the top of the gallery stairs, inciting still further by his language the storm of savage passions that he had raised. Colonel Gordon, a near relative of his lordship's, addressed him thus: "My Lord George, do you intend to bring your rascally adherents into the House of Commons? If you do, the first man of them that enters I will plunge my sword, not into his, but into your body." The greater part of the day the attention of the House of Commons was taken up in

debates concerning the mob. When they had obtained some degree of order, Lord George introduced his business by informing them that he had before him a petition, signed by near one hundred and twenty thousand of his Majesty's Protestant subjects, praying a repeal of the Act passed the last session in favour of the Roman Catholics, and moved to have the said petition brought up. Mr. Alderman Bull seconded the motion, and leave was given accordingly. Having brought up the petition, his lordship then moved to have it taken into immediate consideration, and was again seconded by Mr. Alderman Bull. After some debate the House divided, and there appeared six for the petition and 192 against it. Soon after this the House adjourned, and, the mob having dispersed from the avenues of both Houses, the Guards, who had been called out, were ordered home. This demonstration at Westminster and attempt to overawe the Legislature was but the prelude to the fearful riots which succeeded, and which resulted in 285 people being killed by the troops, and 173 wounded. The number of those who, sacking the houses, perished from inebriation, and in the ruins of the demolished buildings, is not known, but is believed to have been very considerable.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM.

The Child Father of the Man.—As a boy he exhibited the future bent of his life. When other boys were choosing what they would be, he would say, "I will be a statesman." A stone is still shown in the village on which the youthful politician stood and harangued his playmates.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

An Inattentive House.—Mr. Graham was first returned for Hull in 1818, at the age of twenty-six. His election cost his family £6,000. His first appearances in the House were failures. Among his early displays was a

speech with regard to a bill which had been introduced to prevent any person not an inhabitant or freeman of a town from taking part in its political meetings. Mr. Torrens says: "Mr. Graham wished to know if a member who sat for a borough of which he was neither an inhabitant nor freeman would come within the mischief of the Act? He paused to listen for the report of his shot; but few were attending, and nobody cried 'Hear.' He looked to see if it had hit, but the under-secretaries were talking to one another on the Treasury bench, and Lord Castlereagh was occupied in smelling the hot-house flower in his button-hole. Mr. Graham repeated his question in other words, but with no better effect. He felt half vexed with himself at having got up, but he was up, and must go on; so he thought he would argue the point. The case was not an imaginary one, he said, for it was his own, as he happened to sit for a borough of which he was neither a freeman nor an inhabitant, and of which he was not likely to become either, having no connection with the place. At this unlucky proffer of irrelevant information he heard, or thought he heard, something like a suppressed laugh. He felt himself getting confused, a little at first, and then very much so. For a few minutes he rambled on through commonplace and reiteration, but no timely cheer came to his rescue, and he sat down without any distinct recollection of what he had said or what he had intended to say. Mr. Henry Lascelles, who sat opposite, whispered to a mutual friend, 'Well, there is an end of Graham; we shall hear no more of him.'"

"Hats Off!"—On the 20th of June, 1837, the King died at Windsor; and on the same day both Houses met for the purpose of taking the oath of allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria. On the following day Lord John Russell appeared at the bar of the Commons, charged with a message from the Queen. A cry instantly arose of "Hats off!"

and the Speaker, forgetful for the moment of the precise usage on such occasions, announced from the chair that "members must be uncovered." Everyone present forthwith complied, with the exception of Sir James Graham, who excited some observation by continuing to wear his hat until the first words of the message were pronounced. As nothing at the time escaped the vigilance of party criticism, a paragraph appeared the same evening in the *True Sun*, reflecting on the supposed indecorum. At the meeting of the House next day the right honourable baronet called attention to the fact, for the purpose of explaining that he had only complied with the older, and, as he thought, better custom, of waiting until the initiatory word "Regina," or "Rex," was uttered before uncovering; a mode of testifying respect for the Crown which was more emphatic, and which had, he thought, a better effect. * * * The Speaker said that the honourable member for East Cumberland was correct in his observance of the practice of the House; and he accounted for his own apparent deviation therefrom by his desire to preserve order and to save time.—*Torrens' "Life of Graham."*

Disposing of "Hansard."—In 1846 Sir James Graham had made up his mind to defend a Corn Law no more. Sentence after sentence and phrase upon phrase, which had fallen from him in the heat of rhetorical indiscretion in the days when he sat on the left of the Speaker's chair, were now dug up out of "Hansard," and flung at him by exasperated Protectionists, amid the angry cheers of those around him, and the loud laughter of those opposite. But he had anticipated this, and had made up his mind how to deal with it. When challenged by Mr. Stafford to say whether or not he had changed his opinion, he replied, "I freely admit that past declarations of opinions made by members of the House who have subsequently arrived at power, or who aspire to power, much more the declarations made by the

First Minister of the Crown, if at all at variance with the course which he has subsequently pursued, are subjects worthy of reference, and which call for explanation. The honourable member for Northamptonshire made a direct appeal to the Government, and challenged us, if we had changed our opinions, manfully to own it. I answer that challenge. I do frankly avow my change of opinion, and by that avowal I dispose of whole volumes of 'Hansard,' and of all the charges which have been made on the ground of inconsistency."—*Ibid.*

Altered Circumstances.—When addressing the House one evening on the oft-debated subject of the connection between the rate of wages and the price of food, Sir James reiterated his declaration that experience had convinced him that the former had a constant tendency to rise as the latter fell. Lord George Bentinck, who was sitting on the front Opposition bench below him, threw back his head, and looking round at him exclaimed, "Ah! yes; but you know you said the other thing before." A shout of laughter, in which Sir James joined, was followed by cheers and counter-cheers, and curiosity was on tip-toe for the retort. From his perch, as he used to call it, the ex-minister looked down at his noble antagonist, and said, in a tone of ineffable humour, "The noble lord's taunts fall harmless upon me; I am not in office now."—*Ibid.*

SIR WILLIAM GRANT.

A Close Reasoner.—In Parliament he is unquestionably to be classed with speakers of the first order. His style was peculiar; it was that of the closest and severest reasoning ever heard in any popular assembly. The language was choice, perfectly clear, abundantly correct, quite concise, admirably suited to the matter which the words clothed and conveyed. In so far it was felicitous, no

farther; nor did it ever leave behind it any impression of the diction, but only of the things said; the words were forgotten, for they had never drawn off the attention for a moment from the things; those things were alone remembered. No speaker was more easily listened to; none so difficult to answer. Once Mr. Fox, when he was hearing him with a view to making that attempt, was irritated in a way very unwonted to his sweet temper by the conversation of some near him, even to the show of some crossness, and (after an exclamation) sharply said, "Do you think it so very pleasant a thing to have to answer a speech like THAT?"—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

"THE WISDOM OF OUR ANCESTORS."—The signal blunder, which Bacon long ago exposed, of confounding the youth with the age of the species, was never committed by anyone more glaringly than by this great reasoner. He it was who first employed the well-known phrase of "the wisdom of our ancestors;" and the menaced innovation, to stop which he applied it, was the proposal of Sir Samuel Romilly, to take the step of reform, almost imperceptibly small, of subjecting men's real property to the payment of all their debts.—*Ibid.*

HENRY GRATTAN.

PREPARATION FOR PARLIAMENTARY LIFE.—Grattan had taken a residence near Windsor Forest, where he was preparing sedulously for his future destination by addressing imaginary audiences. His landlady took such manifestations much to heart. "What a sad thing it was," she would say, "to see the poor young gentleman all day talking to somebody he calls Mr. Speaker, when there's no speaker in the house except himself."—*Phillips's "Curran and his Contemporaries."*

HIS MANNER IN SPEAKING.—The chief difficulty in this great speaker's way was the first five minutes. During

his exordium laughter was imminent. He bent his body almost to the ground; swung his arms over his head, up and down and around him; and added to the grotesqueness of his manner a hesitating tone, and drawling emphasis. * * * Truly, indeed, might it be said of him as he said of Chatham, "he was very great, and *very odd*." For a time the eye dissented from the verdict of the mind; but at last his genius carried all before it, and, as in the oracles of old, the contortions vanished as the inspirations became manifest.—*Ibid.*

His Grant of £50,000.—In April, 1782, Grattan moved a resolution in the Irish Parliament, the main purport of which was the repeal of the statute of George I., by which England claimed a right to legislate for Ireland. He was at the time in a most feeble state of health, his frame seemed bent down by debility, and everyone supposed he must have sunk under the exertion. But as he proceeded he warmed with the subject, appeared to shake off not merely illness, but mortality, and, amid the tumultuous enthusiasm of the House, he carried his resolution, "That no power on earth could make laws to bind Ireland except her own King, Lords, and Commons.' The motion was afterwards proposed and carried in the English Parliament. The delight and gratitude of the people were unbounded; addresses poured in on him from every village in Ireland, and statues were voted to his memory. The Parliament also voted him a grant of £50,000, as some testimony of the estimation in which he was held. This grant of public money subsequently gave rise to a bitter dispute between Grattan and Flood in the House, which is commemorated in the following epigrammatic dialogue:—

"Question.—Say, what has given to Flood a mortal wound?
Answer.—Grattan's obtaining fifty thousand pound.
Question.—Can Flood forgive an injury so sore?
Answer.—Yes, if they give him fifty thousand more."

—*Annual Register.*

His Oratory leading to the Expulsion of the Students.—The students of Trinity College, Dublin, were allowed free access to the Irish House of Commons to hear the debates, and, in 1792, better accommodation was provided for them than for the public who obtained admission by member's order. "This proud distinction the gownsmen, however, soon forfeited. Lord Fitzwilliam had been sent over as a popular viceroy, and, on his sudden recall, a strong feeling of disappointment prevailed. On a night when the subject was brought before the House, our gallery was full, and I remember well the irrepressible excitement that seemed to actuate us all. At length it broke out. Grattan rose to deprecate the measure, as one calculated to cause the greatest disturbance in Ireland, by what was considered the perfidy of the Government, first exciting the high hopes of the people by promised measures of liberal policy, and then dashing them, by the sudden removal of the man who had been sent over expressly to accomplish them. At the conclusion of Grattan's inflammatory speech, the enthusiasm in the gallery was no longer capable of restraint. We rose as one man, shouting and cheering with the boisterous tumult of a popular meeting. When this subsided, Foster's (the Speaker's) peculiar voice was heard through his nose, ordering the students' gallery to be cleared, and a sergeant-at-arms, with a posse of messengers, entered among us. We were pushed out in a heap without the slightest ceremony, and were never again suffered to enter as privileged persons."—*Ireland Sixty Years Ago* (1851).

The Power of Genius.—On the 15th of January, 1800, the parliamentary session was opened in Ireland with a speech from the throne. Sir Laurence Parsons moved an amendment to the effect that it was their interest and their duty to maintain the local Parliament. A long debate ensued, which was carried far into the morning,

when a scene occurred that seemed the climax of this exciting contest. "Just when Mr. Egan had risen to speak, the doors of the House of Commons were thrown open, and Henry Grattan, who had been returned for Wicklow the night before, entered the House. His form was emaciated by sickness, and his face was worn with anxiety; his limbs tottered; he was obliged to lean upon his friends Arthur Moore and George Ponsonby; he advanced slowly to the table. Acting on the impulse of his really noble nature, Castlereagh rose at the head of the Treasury Bench, and remained standing and uncovered while the venerable patriot took the oaths. Grattan then moved slowly to his seat, selecting a place beside Mr. Plunket, and, having obtained permission to speak sitting, he addressed the House for nearly two hours in a speech of great power."—*Life of Lord Plunket.*

A Friend's Defence.—On one occasion, in the Irish Parliament, Mr. Fitzgibbon had attacked Mr. Grattan, who was not at that time present. Mr. Yelverton defended his absent friend, saying, "The learned gentleman has stated what Mr. Grattan is; I will state what he is not. He is not styed in his prejudices; he does not trample on the resuscitation of his country, or live like a caterpillar on the decline of her prosperity; he does not stickle for the letter of the constitution with the affectation of a prude, and abandon its principles with the effrontery of a prostitute."—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

Waiting for the Signal.—"I have heard that when Grattan made his first speech in the English Commons, it was for some minutes doubtful whether to laugh at or cheer him. The *début* of his predecessor, Flood, had been a complete failure, under nearly similar circumstances; but when the ministerial part of our senators had watched Pitt (their thermometer) for the cue, and saw him nod repeatedly his stately nod of approbation, they took the hint from

their huntsman, and broke out into the most rapturous cheers. Grattan's speech, indeed, deserved them; it was a *chef-d'œuvre.*"—*Byron* (*Moore's* "*Life*"). When he rose (says Phillips) every voice in that crowded House was hushed—the great rivals, Pitt and Fox, riveted their eyes on him. He strode forth and gesticulated—the hush became ominous—not a cheer was heard—men looked in one another's faces and then at the phenomenon before them, as if doubting his identity; at last, and on a sudden, the indication of the master spirit came. Pitt was the first generously to recognise it; he smote his thigh hastily with his hand—it was an impulse when he was pleased—his followers saw it, and knew it, and with a universal burst they hailed the advent and the triumph of the stranger.

EARL GREY.

His First Appearance in the House.—Charles, second Earl Grey, was returned in July, 1786, at the age of twenty-two, for his native county (Northumberland). His maiden speech in the House was delivered in opposition to the address moved by Mr. Blackburne to thank his Majesty for the Commercial Treaty with France, negotiated by Mr. Pitt. Mr. Addington, afterwards Speaker, in a letter to his father, thus describes the youthful orator:—"We had a glorious debate last night upon the motion for an address of thanks to the King for having negotiated the Commercial Treaty, &c. * * * A new speaker presented himself to the House, and went through his first performance with an *éclat* which has not been equalled within my recollection. His name is Grey. * * * I do not go too far in declaring that in the advantage of figure, voice, elocution, and manner, he is not surpassed by any member of the House; and I grieve to say that he is in

the ranks of Opposition, from which there is no chance of his being detached."—*Life and Opinions of Lord Grey.*

His own Estimate of his Debating Talent.—Writing to Lady Grey in 1804, after a discussion in the Commons on the King's illness, he remarks, "You will see that I only said a few words, and those few were as bad as anything that could have come from the Doctor (Mr. Addington's usual *soubriquet*) himself. I feel very much the want of habit and experience in debate, which is absolutely necessary to give that readiness without which nothing can be done, and which I unfortunately do not naturally possess. I feel more and more convinced of my unfitness for a pursuit which I detest, which interferes with all my private comfort, and which I only sigh for an opportunity of abandoning decidedly and for ever. Do not think this is the language of momentary low spirits; it really is the settled conviction of my mind."—*Ibid.*

"No, no," in the Lords.—In a discussion on the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill, in the House of Lords, July 11th, 1833, the Duke of Cumberland interrupted Earl Grey with a cry of "No, no;" whereupon (reports "Hansard") the noble earl "trusted that the illustrious duke would have the decency not to interrupt him. The noble duke had a right to maintain his opinion: he might, if he pleased, rise and defend it; but, because he had an opinion, he was not justified in interrupting those who differed from him." Lord Kenyon appealed to their lordships whether the dissent expressed by using the word "No" deserved the character of indecency the noble earl had ascribed to it. Earl Grey certainly did conceive that the sort of interruption he had received was indecent. The Duke of Cumberland believed that there was no man in that House would more unwillingly commit an act of indecency than himself; but if a noble lord were not to be allowed to call "No, no," when he felt inclined to

dissent from a proposition, there would be an end of all liberty of speech.

Regrets.—In 1793 he brought forward his motion for referring the petition of the "Friends of the People," praying for parliamentary reform, to a committee. Respecting his connection with this society, General Grey says: "During his last illness, when no longer able to walk, he used to be wheeled about the House in a chair, and on one occasion, when stopping, as he often did, before Mr. Fox's bust, and speaking of the influence he had held over him, he added, 'Yet he did not always use it as he might have done; one word from him would have kept me out of all that mess of the "Friends of the People," but he never spoke it.' When I remarked that, considering he only advocated as one of the society the principles to which he had given effect as minister, this was hardly to be regretted, he replied, 'That might be true, but there were men joined with them in that society whose views, though he did not know it at the time, were widely different from his own, and with whom it was not safe to have any communication.' On mentioning this conversation to the late Lord Dacre, he told me he remembered Mr. Fox used always to say he did not like to discourage the young ones."—*Life and Opinions.*

WILLIAM GERARD HAMILTON.

The "Single Speech."—Lord Halifax was the First Lord-Lieutenant of George III. His secretary was William Gerard Hamilton, known by the name of "Single-Speech Hamilton," having made one splendid speech, which he left unequalled ever after. His first measure was a proposal to raise six regiments of Irish Roman Catholics, amounting to three thousand men, to be officered by Catholics, and to be taken into the pay of an ally, Portugal. He proposed this in a long and excellent speech; but the measure met with so much

opposition from the Protestant party that it was ultimately given up by the Government.—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

JOHN HAMPDEN.

His Influence in Parliament.—Hampden very seldom rose till late in a debate. His speaking was of that kind which has, in every age, been held in the highest estimation by English Parliaments—ready, weighty, perspicuous, condensed. His perception of the feelings of the House was exquisite, his temper unalterably placid, his manner eminently courteous and gentlemanlike. His talents for business were as remarkable as his talents for debate. Yet it was rather to his moral than to his intellectual qualities that he was indebted for the vast influence which he possessed. "When this (the Long) Parliament began," says Clarendon, "the eyes of all men were fixed upon him, as their *patriæ pater*, and the pilot that must steer the vessel through the tempests and rocks which threatened it. And I am persuaded his power and interest at that time were greater to do good or hurt than any man's in the kingdom, or than any man of his rank hath had in any time."—*Macaulay's Essay on Hampden.*

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE.

Very Peremptory.—On the day Lord Talbot died (Feb. 14th, 1737) the Great Seal was delivered up by his executors into the hands of George II. Lord Hardwicke was now regarded as decidedly the most useful man to be introduced into the Cabinet, and to preside on the woolsack as Chancellor. But there being some difficulty as to the accompanying arrangements, the Great Seal remained for a whole week in the personal custody of the King. Meanwhile, as Parliament was sitting, and there was no Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper, it was necessary to provide a Speaker

for the House of Lords, and the Great Seal, while in the King's possession, was (somewhat irregularly) put to a commission authorising Lord Hardwicke to act in that capacity. He accordingly did act for several days as Speaker, without being Chancellor. During this interval it is related that Walpole, resisting some of Hardwicke's demands, said to him by way of threat—"I must offer the seals to Fazakerly." "Fazakerly!" exclaimed Hardwicke, "impossible! he is certainly a Tory—perhaps a Jacobite!" "It's all very true," coolly replied Sir Robert, taking out his watch; "but if by one o'clock you do not accept my offer, Fazakerly, by two, becomes Lord Keeper, and one of the stanchest Whigs in all England." The bargain was immediately closed, and Lord Hardwicke was contented with the promise that the next Tellership should be bestowed upon his son.—*Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors."*

Titles and Trappings.—The Earl of Hardwicke had been so long known and spoken of as Lord Chancellor, that many of his friends even had forgotten his hereditary title. Upon his first appearance at the royal levee after his resignation (1756) he was announced as the Earl of Hardwicke, but the King, with whom he had been much in favour, not recognising the title, merely replied by his usual cold question, "How long has his lordship been in town?" When he advanced, the alteration in his appearance caused by the absence of the wig and robes completed the delusion; the Earl left the presence-chamber without being recognised by the master whom he had served so long.—*Cooke's "History of Party."*

ROBERT HARLEY.

House of Commons Tact.—Confessedly one of the most influential of the members of the House of Commons was he whom the last three Parliaments of William III. elected for their Speaker; yet no man would have listened patiently for

five minutes to Robert Harley anywhere but in the House of Commons. There he was supreme. The country gentlemen voted for him, though they remembered that his family went to a meeting-house. The younger members put forth their most able and graceful representative to honour him, when Henry St. John seconded his third nomination. And posterity itself had cause to be grateful to him when, employing for once this influence in its service, he joined Tory and Whig in a common demand for the best securities of the Act of Settlement. It was not genius, it was not eloquence, it was not statesmanship that had given Harley this extraordinary power. It was House of Commons tact.—*Forster's Essay on De Foe.*

Endurance of the English People.—Pope relates that some one had observed of a measure proposed, that the people would never bear it. "None of us," replied Harley, "know how far the good people of England will bear."

FRANCIS HORNER.

His First Canvass.—On the 19th of October, 1806, Mr. Francis Horner received an offer of a seat in Parliament from Lord Kinnaird, which he accepted, untrammelled by any conditions. St. Ives was the borough destined for him, and in a letter to his mother from that place he gives some account of the election proceedings. "I am glad enough," he says, "none of you were here to quiz me as I went through my duty; entering every cellar in the place, and behaving as sweet as possible to every man, woman, and child. * * * I did sometimes feel ashamed of myself, I own, and there were some hands that went against my stomach, if it had not been for the number of pretty women, three or four of them quite beautiful, whom I found in these hovels."—*Horner's Memoirs and Correspondence.*

Treaties of Peace.—Mr. Horner took part in the

debate which arose on the treaties of peace entered into consequent on the downfall of Napoleon. A speech delivered by him in the House of Commons, February 20th, 1816, attracted much attention at the time. Referring to the guarantees to be exacted from France, he said: "The real security which was required from France, after the destruction of that military monarchy which oppressed the greatest part of the continent of Europe, combined the integrity of that kingdom with the establishment of a government agreeably to the wishes and deserving of the confidence of the people. The question of territorial cession had been discussed at great length, and he would merely state that, in his opinion, any attempt to dismember France, instead of being likely to afford any security for the continuance of peace, would be the certain source of inquietude and danger. * * * There was no chance of the stability of peace if guarantees were sought for in measures that must be galling and irritating to the French people; there was no chance of continued tranquillity but in conciliatory arrangements; there was no chance of reconciling them to Europe but by allowing them to establish the government they liked. We could never rationally entertain confidence in the pacific dispositions of people upon whom we forced a government of conquest, which we maintained by arms."—*Ibid.*

An Element of Stability.—Referring to the motion in the House of Commons for a new writ for St. Mawes in the room of Francis Horner, March 6th, 1817, and to the encomiums on the character of the deceased member embodied in the motion, Sir James Mackintosh, writing in his Journal, says: "A Howard introduced, and an English House of Commons adopted, the proposition of thus honouring the memory of a man of thirty-eight, the son of a shopkeeper, who never filled an office, or had the power of obliging a living creature, and whose grand

title to this distinction was the belief of his virtue. How, honourable to the age and to the House! A country where such sentiments prevail is not ripe for destruction."

JOSEPH HUME.

Small Economies.—Hume had been a surgeon in India, and had made a fortune. He had an office and kept a clerk at his own cost, in order to examine the estimates and accounts of public moneys, and to prepare his statements and facts; and by his attention to economy effected a considerable reduction in the national expenditure. He had his faults, which produced political errors, for he looked rather to what in his mind was desirable than to what was practicable. That kind of feeling predominated throughout. He suggested even the smallest economies. Gilt-edged paper was, I take it, given up in consequence of his observation on the extravagance of using it for parliamentary notices. Parker, secretary to the Treasury, brought up some reports. Hume remarked, "I think that splendid gilt paper is unnecessary." Parker, nettled at this, replied, "Perhaps the honourable member may think the margins are too wide;" but it had its effect, and in a short time the paper in the library and writing-rooms, as well as all the future reports, had no gilt edges. Soon after it went out of fashion altogether.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

Fighting against Majorities.—In a speech at Birmingham in 1849, Mr. Cobden thus alluded to Hume's parliamentary career: "I wish our friend Mr. Hume was here to-night. You do well to receive his name with those plaudits. A more indefatigable, a more devoted, a more disinterested patriot never lived in this or in any other country. * * * He has for nearly forty years fought against majorities in the House of Commons. But it is given to few men to possess his physical strength, his

massive endurance, his powerful energies, his impassive temperament. But few men have the power to do that which he has accomplished. I confess that I have not physically the power of going through one-half of his work."—*Cobden's Speeches in* 1849, *revised by himself.*

A Sine qua Non.—I recollect a saying of Sir Robert Peel, that he could not conceive a House of Commons without a Joseph Hume.—*Lord Broughton's "Recollections."*

Support of the Speaker's Warrant.—In 1845 a discussion occurred in the House of Commons on a question of privilege. The Sergeant-at-Arms, Sir William Gossett, had executed a Speaker's warrant against one Thomas Howard, but an action was brought in the Queen's Bench by the latter against the Sergeant for excess of authority in staying an unreasonable time in his house, and £200 damages were awarded to him. Execution was to be levied in a day or two, when Mr. Hume remarked: "I hope the House will order any attempt that may be made to seize upon the property of the Sergeant to be most severely punished forthwith. If any one will draw up a resolution to that effect, I will move it, and, if necessary, I will assist in executing your warrant. It will not be the first time, sir, that I have personally assisted in promoting the ends of justice. I was the first to seize upon the person who committed an act of murder within the precincts of this place—I allude to the person who shot the late Mr. Perceval—and I kept him fast until a magistrate was found to whose custody he was delivered. I conceive, sir, that every member of this House is bound to act in the same manner; and, as you are authorised to call upon all magistrates and persons in authority to assist in carrying your warrant into effect, so I think you have a prior claim upon the assistance of the members of this House in enforcing and upholding your authority." The House adjourned the debate, and suffered the execution to be levied.

A Free Translation.—In the discussions on the Orange system in 1835-36 Mr. Joseph Hume took an active, and, as usually happens with him, a manly and an honest part. Here, however, his excitement betrayed his tongue. Mr. Sheil, alluding to the disclaimer of a certain personage of very high rank, that he had been aware of the fact of his name being at the foot of warrants for the creation of Orange lodges, which had been distributed in some of the regiments of the line, had said, "When I am called upon to give credit to this disclaimer, I take refuge in one of the *dicta* of my creed, and I say, *Credo quia impossibile!*" To this Mr. Hume appended the following free translation: "Like the honourable member who has preceded me I say, in reference to the denial, *Credo quia impossibile*—Let who will believe it—I will not!"—*John O'Connell's "Parliamentary Experiences."*

The Duties of an Archdeacon.—Lord Althorp, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, having to propose to the House of Commons a vote of £400 a year for the salary of the Archdeacon of Bengal, was puzzled by a question from Mr. Hume, "What are the duties of an archdeacon?" So he sent one of the subordinate occupants of the Treasury Bench to the other House to obtain an answer to the question from one of the bishops. The messenger first met with Archbishop Vernon Harcourt, who described an archdeacon as "*aide-de-camp* to the bishop;" and then with Bishop Copleston, of Llandaff, who said, "The archdeacon is *oculus episcopi.*" Lord Althorp, however, declared that neither of these explanations would satisfy the House. "Go," said he, "and ask the Bishop of London (Blomfield); he is a straightforward man, and will give you a plain answer." To the Bishop of London accordingly the messenger went, and repeated the question, "What is an archdeacon?" "An archdeacon?" replied the bishop in his quick way—"an archdeacon is an ecclesiastical officer who performs archi-

diaconal functions;" and with this reply Lord Althorp and the House were perfectly satisfied.—*Blomfield's "Memoir of Bishop Blomfield."*

"ORATOR HUNT."

The White Hat.—Henry Hunt was the accepted leader of the discontented, and his inflammatory orations were published and circulated all over the country. He was the Radical of his age. The white hat he wore was regarded as almost as significant as the republican *bonnet rouge* in the Reign of Terror.—*Life of T. S. Duncombe.*

Exchanging Looks.—Mr. Hunt, member for Preston, while addressing the House of Commons in support of the Reform Bill in 1831, said, "Now, when the honourable member for Calne (Mr. Macaulay) was talking so much of the rabble, he looked very hard at me (loud laughter). I understand that laugh. But I am only sorry that the honourable member for Calne has not remained in his place, that I might now have looked in the same way at him."—*Hansard.*

MR. HUSKISSON.

Legal Phraseology in the House of Commons.—Mr. Huskisson will be remembered as one of the earliest advocates, among our statesmen, of the principles of Free Trade. His eloquence was often forcible, and his style at times very argumentative, whilst he knew how to make an effective reply. In February, 1826, Mr. Ellice, member for Coventry, had moved for a select committee on the silk trade, and he was seconded by Mr. Williams, a lawyer, member for Lincoln. To some severe remarks by the latter gentleman Mr. Huskisson thus replied: "In the course of his speech the honourable and learned gentleman repeatedly told us that he was not at liberty to admit

this, and to admit that. This, I presume, is a mode of expression in which gentlemen of the legal profession are wont to indulge, to mark that they keep within the strict limits of their briefs, and that the doctrines which they advocate are those prescribed to them by their instructions. However customary and proper such language may be in the courts of law, it certainly sounds new and striking in the mouth of a member of this House." He went on to say, "To whom did the honourable and learned gentleman mean to apply the description of an 'insensible and hard-hearted metaphysician, exceeding the devil in point of malignity?' I appeal to the judgment of the House whether the language made use of by the honourable and learned gentleman, with reference to me, was not such as to point to the inference that I am that metaphysician. * * * It is for the honourable and learned gentleman to reconcile such language with the general tenor of his sentiments on other occasions—to explain, as he best may, to those around him whether they are included in that insinuation; and it is for me to meet that insinuation (as far as it was levelled at me) with those feelings of utter scorn with which I now repel it."

His Death at the Opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway.—The *Annual Register* gives an account of the fatal accident to Mr. Huskisson at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, on the 15th of October, 1830, from which the following particulars are taken:—The procession, drawn by eight locomotive engines, left Liverpool twenty minutes before eleven o'clock. The engine Northumbrian took the south line of railway, carrying amongst other passengers the Duke of Wellington. The other seven engines proceeded along the north line. On the stoppage of the Northumbrian at Parkside, Mr. Huskisson and several others got out; and Mr. Holmes, for the purpose of bringing Mr. Huskisson and the duke together,

and of producing a renewed good feeling between them, led Mr. Huskisson round to that part of the car where the duke was stationed. The duke, perceiving the advance of the right honourable gentleman, immediately held out to him his hand, which was shaken in a very cordial manner. Almost at this moment the Rocket was seen to be advancing, and Mr. Huskisson, in attempting to enter the ducal car, fell upon the rails and had his right leg crushed by the wheel of the engine. The unfortunate gentleman lingered in great agony till the evening, when he expired. In the interval he showed a natural solicitude respecting his character as a statesman. "The country," said he, "has had the best of me. I trust that it will do justice to my public character." On the 24th of September his remains were interred in presence of upwards of 15,000 spectators.

SIR ROBERT INGLIS.

Influence of Character in Parliament.—On the death of Sir Robert Harry Inglis, who for a long period had represented the University of Oxford, the following tribute was paid to his memory by the *Times*:—"Sir R. H. Inglis has been for a whole generation one of the most conspicuous and honourable personages in the great council of the nation. Much more than any other living man, he illustrates the force of what English people are proud to call 'character.' People may or may not have valued his opinions, or respected his reasoning powers; they may or may not have followed the lead of one who scarcely ever assumed to guide; but all respected, admired, and even loved the honest, hearty, genial, courteous gentleman, who spoke the whole truth, as he held it, from his whole soul, with no respect either of persons or of circumstances, and apparently with no other object than to record a clear testimony and quiet his own conscience. Hence, while it would

be difficult to say what Sir R. H. Inglis has done, what vote he has carried, what measure he has forwarded or delayed, he has undoubtedly possessed a great, though indefinite, weight in the Legislature. No one who ever heard him speak could fail to understand how it was that he won the respect and affection of men who, nevertheless, declined to acquiesce in his conclusions."

DR. LAURENCE.

SUGGESTIVE ORATORY.—He had (says Brougham) the very worst delivery ever witnessed—a delivery calculated to alienate the mind of the hearer, to beguile him of his attention, but by stealing it away from the speaker, and almost to prevent him from comprehending what was so uncouthly spoken. It was in reference to this unvarying effect of Dr. Laurence's delivery that Mr. Fox once said, a man should attend, if possible, to a speech of his, and then speak it over again himself: it must, he conceived, succeed infallibly, for it was sure to be admirable in itself, and as certain of being new to the audience. But in this saying there was considerably more wit than truth. The doctor's speech was sure to contain materials not for one, but for half-a-dozen speeches; and a person might with great advantage listen to it, in order to use those materials, in part, afterwards; as indeed many did, both in Parliament and at the Bar where he practised, make an effort to attend to him, how difficult soever, in order to hear all that could be said upon every part of the question. Lord Brougham adds that he had repeatedly tried at the Bar the experiment mentioned by Fox, to a certain extent, and with success.

"ONCE BIT, TWICE SHY."—The outward aspect of this excellent and eminent man was unwieldy, and almost grotesque. His mouth especially excited observation; and being fancied to resemble a shark's, the House of Commons

jest ran that Alderman Brook Watson, who had lost his leg by that animal's bite, avoided the side where the doctor sat or lay.—*Brougham's "Statesmen."* Alderman Watson and his accident are thus alluded to in "The Rolliad":—

> "'One moment's time might I presume to beg,'
> Cries modest Watson, on his wooden leg;
> That leg in which such wondrous art is shown,
> It almost seems to serve him as his own.
> Oh! had the monster who for breakfast ate
> That luckless limb, his nobler noddle met,
> The best of workmen and the best of wood
> Had scarce supplied him with a head so good."

LORD LIVERPOOL.

Superlative Praise.—In the course of the year 1790, the authority of Sir James Lowther over the borough of Appleby—the same which had the honour of giving Pitt the first opportunity of displaying his precocious genius to the Parliament of his country—was exerted to procure the election of Mr. Jenkinson (afterwards the second Lord Liverpool). He did not rise in the House till he had been for above a year a member of it; though it is no slight proof how great was the expectation which was already formed of him that, on the occasion of Mr. Whitbread moving a censure on the Government on the question known as the Russian Armament, Pitt selected him to open the debate on his side. * * * Our parliamentary annals have recorded no maiden speech which made so great an impression. Pitt himself began his own harangue by pronouncing it "not only a more able first speech than had ever been heard from a young member, but one so full of philosophy and science, strong and perspicuous language, and sound and convincing arguments, that it would have done credit to the most practised debater and most experienced statesman that ever existed."—*Yonge's "Life of Lord Liverpool."*

His Character as a Debater.—He was never known to utter a word at which any one could take exception. He was, besides, the most fair and candid of all debaters. No advantage to be derived from a misrepresentation, or even an omission, ever tempted him to forego the honest and the manly satisfaction of stating the fact as it was, treating his adversary as he deserved, and at least reciting fairly what had been urged against him, if he could not successfully answer it.—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

LORD LOUGHBOROUGH.

Completing a Quotation.—George Grenville, leader of the Opposition, having brought forward his famous Bill for the Trial of Controverted Elections (March 22nd, 1770), it was opposed by Lord North and the Government; and De Grey, the Attorney-General, made a long speech against its dangerous innovations, concluding thus:—"In short, sir, although there no doubt have hitherto been irregularities and even abuses while the House retained to itself its constitutional power of deciding election petitions, it is better to endure the evils of which we know the extent than, in a sudden start of disgust and humoursome passion, fly to others that we know not of." Wedderburn (afterwards Lord Loughborough), rising immediately after, continued Hamlet's soliloquy—

> "And thus the native hue of resolution
> Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought;
> And enterprises of great pith and moment
> With this regard their current turn awry,
> And lose the name of action."
>
> —*Campbell's "Lives."*

The Two Baths.—When Miss Pulteney was created Baroness Bath, there being a Marquis of Bath, of another family, existing, Lord Radnor made a motion in the House of Lords against the patent, contending that it was uncon-

stitutional and illegal to create two peers with the same title, and that great inconvenience would arise from it; as in their lordships' proceedings "Bath" might often appear opposed to "Bath." Lord Loughborough thereupon said: "My lords, in this case there is a sure way of preventing the future antagonism which haunts the imagination of the noble earl, for, the heir-apparent of the marquis being a bachelor, he may marry the young and beautiful baroness, and then Bath will be merged in Bath!"—*Parliamentary History.*

MR. LOWE.

"Tampering" with the House of Commons.—Mr. Lowe attained first rank as a debater by his speeches against Reform in Parliament between 1865 and 1867. The following characteristic passage occurred in a speech delivered in March, 1866:—"In the course of a long and illustrious career, this House of Commons has gathered into its hands a very large proportion of the political power of the country. It has outlived the influence of the Crown; it has shaken off the dictation of the aristocracy; in finance and taxation it is supreme; it has a very large share in legislation; it can control and unmake, and sometimes nearly make, the executive Government. Probably, when the time shall arrive that the history of this nation shall be written as the history of that which has passed away, it may be thought that too much power and too much influence were concentrated and condensed in this great assembly, and that England put too much to hazard on the personal qualifications of those who sit within these walls. But, sir, in proportion as the powers of the House of Commons are great and paramount, so does the exploit of endeavouring to amend its constitution become one of the highest and noblest efforts of statesmanship. To tamper with it lightly, to deal with it with unskilled hands, is one of the most signal acts

of presumption or folly." It was in the same speech that, alluding to the influence of the constituencies on the House, Mr. Lowe remarked, "As the polypus takes its colour from the rock to which it affixes itself, so do the members of this House take their character from the constituencies. If you lower the character of the constituencies, you lower that of the representatives, and you lower the character of this House."—*Lowe's Speeches on Reform.*

The "Shuttlecock" of Reform.—Political Bedfellows.—Mr. Lowe was at times severely facetious on the abortive attempts made by successive Governments to settle the question of Parliamentary Reform. On one occasion he remarked, "The way in which the two parties have tossed this question from one to the other, reminds me of nothing so much as a young lady and young gentleman playing at battledore and shuttlecock. After tossing the shuttlecock from one to the other a few times, they let it drop and begin to flirt." In a speech in May, 1866, on the Reform Bill of Earl Russell's Administration, he thus noticed the objection raised by the Government to a postponement of the measure, that their honour would not permit them to take that course: "I think we have heard too much about the honour of the Government. The honour of the Government obliged them to bring in a Reform Bill in 1860. It was withdrawn under circumstances which I need not allude to, and, as soon as it was withdrawn, the honour of the Government went to sleep. It slept for five years. Session after session it never so much as winked. As long as Lord Palmerston lived, honour slept soundly; but when Lord Palmerston died, and Lord Russell succeeded by seniority to his place, the 'sleeping beauty' woke up. * * * I think there was no great accession of honour gained last Monday in the division, when the House really by their vote took the management of the committee out of the hands of the executive. All these things do not matter

much to ordinary mortals, but to people of a Castilian turn of mind they are very serious. Sir, I have come to the conclusion that there must be two kinds of honour, and the only consolation I can administer to the Government is in the words of Hudibras—

> 'If he that's in the battle slain
> Be on the bed of honour lain,
> Then he that's beaten may be said,
> To lie on honour's truckle-bed.'"

To this Mr. Gladstone retorted, "All that portion of the right honourable gentleman's speech was one gross and continued error both of taste and judgment. Because, sir, in these matters we must look, not only at the merits of the sermon, but at the individuality of the preacher; and I want to know what charge is to be made against the Government on this score which cannot be made at the very least as easily against my right honourable friend? In that 'truckle-bed' there may be a bed-fellow."

DR. LUCAS.

A RETRACTATION.—Dr. Lucas, who held one of the seats for Dublin in the Irish Parliament, made an attack upon his colleague, Mr. James Grattan, the Recorder. Grattan opposed the Septennial Bill, and Lucas, alluding to him ironically, said, "He who is so *sure* of being returned for the city—he who has the voice of the people of Dublin with him." Upon this the Recorder lost his temper, and got up to call Lucas to order. Lucas, who had a great deal of self-possession, in a plain voice replied, "If I am out of order, I will unsay all I have said. Well, then, the Recorder of the city of Dublin, who is so certain of *not* being returned at the next election—he who has the voice of the people directly *against* him."—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

SHORT TEMPER AND LONG SWORD.—Hutchinson,

having taken offence at something said by Lucas in the Irish Parliament, concluded a severe reply by saying of him, "Ready to wound, but yet afraid to strike; a shattered understanding, a warm head, and a cold heart." Lucas could not gain self-possession enough to answer this, and he had recourse to fighting instead. He selected Mr. Adderly as his second, who had no idea of danger, and was determined that Lucas should have none either. Accordingly, he kept Lucas with him, and would not allow him to return to his wife. Lucas, however, who had lost the use of his legs, determined to fight with a very long sword, which he chose for the occasion. Mr. Adderly also provided him with a case of pistols, and thus doubly prepared him for the encounter. The matter, however, was adjusted by the seconds, to the satisfaction of all parties.—*Ibid.*

A Pitiful Failure.—When Dr. Lucas, a very unpopular man, ventured on a speech in the Irish Parliament, and failed altogether, Henry Grattan said, "He rose without a friend, and sat down without an enemy."—*S. Rogers' "Recollections."*

LORD LYNDHURST.

His First Appearance in the Commons.—In 1817 Mr. Copley (afterwards Lord Lyndhurst) was returned to serve in Parliament for Yarmouth, in the Isle of Wight. * * * He first broke silence in the House by a few observations in support of the practice, now abandoned and universally condemned, of giving rewards to witnesses upon the conviction of offenders. "He entered his protest against the broad assertion hazarded by an honourable member, that the system of granting rewards had been productive of great confusion throughout the country. He himself," he said, "had been engaged for fourteen years

on the Midland Circuit, and had never known a single instance to justify such a statement."—*Campbell's "Lives."*

Views and Prospects.—Lord Lyndhurst, when Solicitor-General, replying to a taunt of the Marquis of Tavistock, during a debate on the Blasphemous Libel Bill in 1819, said, "I would ask the noble lord on what grounds he brings charges against me for my former conduct? Why am I taunted with inconsistency? I never, before my entrance into this House, belonged to any political society, or was in any way connected with politics; and even if I had intended to connect myself with any party, I confess that during my short parliamentary experience I have seen nothing in the *views* of the gentlemen opposite to induce me to join them." —*Hansard.* "This harangue," says Earl Russell (preface to "Life of Moore") "was delivered from the Treasury Bench, and was received with derision by the Whig leaders, to whom it was addressed. At the conclusion, Mackintosh whispered to Lord John Russell, who sat next to him, 'The last sentence, with the change of one word for a synonyme, would have been perfectly true. Instead of quarrelling with our *views*, he should have said that he did not like our *prospects*.'"

A Plagiarism.—Campbell, in his "Life of Lord Lyndhurst," referring to the celebrated speech against Catholic Emancipation, delivered March 6th, 1827, by the subject of his biography—who was at that time Master of the Rolls—states that, at the close of his harangue, he sat down amidst some cheers and a great deal of tittering. The latter indications of feeling arose from the circumstance that all the historical facts and arguments which he had used were to be found, nearly in the same order, in a very able pamphlet recently published by Dr. Philpotts, then Prebendary of Durham. Before Copley concluded, the plagiarism was detected by several members, and a stanza from a well-known song was whispered through the House:—

"Dear Tom, this brown jug which now foams with mild ale,
Out of which I now drink to sweet Nan of the Vale,
Was once Toby Philpotts'."

A Speech in his Eighty-eighth Year.—On the 21st of May, 1860, the Nestor of the House of Lords, as he was styled, then in his 88th year, delivered a long and able speech against the second reading of the Bill for the Repeal of the Paper Duty. He thus maintained the right of the Lords to reject a money bill: "I do not dispute—nor can it be for a moment disputed—that we have no right whatsoever to amend what is called a money bill. We have, moreover, no right whatsoever to originate a bill of that nature. But that principle does not apply to the rejection of money bills. I take leave to say that there is not an instance to be found in which the House of Commons has controverted our right to reject money bills. * * * My lords, as I said I would confine myself to this question of privilege, I will only further observe, that the illusions—perhaps I may say the delusions—created by the introduction of the Budget seem to have passed away, and we have learned that, although brilliant eloquence has charms, yet, like other seductions, it is not without its dangers. The same schemes may bear the impress of genius, of imprudence, of rashness. *Satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum*, is not an irreconcilable combination."—*Hansard.*

LORD LYTTON.

Early Appearance as a Reformer.—Mr. Bulwer (Lord Lytton) first sat in Parliament as the representative of St. Ives, for which constituency he was returned in 1831; and he addressed the House on the 5th of July, on the second reading of the Reform Bill. On that occasion he thus expressed himself on behalf of a popular representation: "At a time when authority can no longer support itself by

the solemn plausibilities and the ceremonial hypocrisies of old, it was well that a government should be placed upon a solid and sure foundation. In no age of the world, but least of all in the present, could any system of government long exist which was menaced both by the moral intelligence and the physical force of a country."—*Hansard.*

Democracy.—Speaking on the Reform Bill introduced by Lord Palmerston's Government in 1860, Sir E. Bulwer-Lytton said: "Pure democracy, in the classic sense of the word, has conferred on the civilised world too many benefits, as well as warnings, not to have its full share of enthusiastic admirers among men of cultivated minds and generous hearts. But for pure democracy you must have the elements that preserve its honesty and ensure its duration. Those elements are not to be found in old societies, with vast disparities of wealth, of influence, of education; they belong to the youth of nations, such as colonies; and when any gentleman cites to us the example of a colony for some democratic change that he would recommend to the ancient monarchy of England, I can only say that he has not studied the horn-book of legislation. The acute democrats of that sublime republic by which we are all unconsciously instructed whenever we discuss the problems of government—the acute democrats of Athens—were well aware of the truth I endeavour, before it is yet too late, to impress upon you; they were well aware that democracy cannot long co-exist with great inequalities of wealth and power; they therefore began by ostracising the powerful, to end by persecuting the wealthy."—*Ibid.*

Ministerial Coalitions.—In a speech on Mr. Roebuck's celebrated motion in January, 1855, Sir E. B. Lytton made a very effective remark on this subject. He said: "Looking through our modern history, I find that most of our powerful, even popular Administrations, have been coalitions. Both the Administrations of Mr. Pitt were co-

alitions; and the last was very remarkable, for he first turned out the Addington Government, and then coalesced with six of its members. Nay, he was not contented till he had netted the expelled Prime Minister himself, and made him Lord President of the Council. But then there is one indisputable element of a coalition, and that is, that *its members should coalesce.* Now, sir, it is that element which seems to me wanting in the present Cabinet (Lord Aberdeen's). It has been a union of party interests, but not a coalition of party sentiment and feeling."—*Ibid.*

LORD MACAULAY.

His Characteristics as a Speaker.—By all accounts Macaulay's delivery was far too rapid to be impressive; it wanted also variety and flexibility of intonation. Even the most practised reporters panted after him in vain; how much more the slower intellects of country gentlemen and the mass of the House! This, however, only heightens our astonishment that speeches so full, so profoundly meditated, yet with so much freedom, with no appearance of being got by heart, with such prodigality of illustration and allusion, should be poured forth with such unhesitating flow, with such bewildering quickness of utterance. To read them with delight and profit, we read them rather slowly; we can hardly conceive that they were spoken less deliberately. It may be questioned, and has been questioned, whether Macaulay was, or could have become, a masterly debater. This accomplishment, except in rare examples, is acquired only by long use and practice. When Macaulay entered the House, the first places were filled by men of established influence and much parliamentary training. Even if he had felt called upon to make himself more prominent, it may be doubted whether he could have sufficiently curbed his impetuous energy, or checked his torrent of

words. He would have found it difficult to assume the stately, prudent, reserved, compressed reply; he might have torn his adversaries' arguments to shreds, but he would not have been content without a host of other arguments, and so would have destroyed the effect of his own confutation. Still, it is remarkable that on two occasions a speech of Macaulay's actually turned the vote of the House, and carried the question (a very rare event) in his own way —the debate on the Copyright Act, and the question of judges holding seats in the House of Commons. Though he took his seat, Lord Macaulay never spoke in the House of Peers; he went down, we believe, more than once with the intention of speaking, but some unexpected turn in the debate deprived him of his opportunity; his friends, who knew the feeble state of his health at that time, were almost rejoiced at their disappointment in not hearing him in that which would have been so congenial a field for his studied and matured eloquence.—"*Memoir*," *by Dean Milman.*

"Express Train" Oratory.—The following graphic sketch of his demeanour in the House and his manner in delivery is from Francis's "Orators of the Age":—"In the House of Commons, abstraction is his chief characteristic. He enters the House with a certain pole-star to guide him—his seat; how he reaches it seems as if it were a process unknown to him. Seated, he folds his arms and sits in silence, seldom speaking to his colleagues, or appearing to notice what is going forward. * * * An opening is made in the discussion, and he rises, or rather darts up from his seat, plunging at once into the very heart of his subject, without exordium or apologetic preface. In fact, you have for a few seconds heard a voice, pitched in alto, monotonous, and rather shrill, pouring forth words with inconceivable velocity, ere you have become aware that a new speaker, and one of no common order, has broken in upon the debate. A few seconds more, and cheers—perhaps from all parts of the

House—rouse you from your apathy, compelling you to follow that extremely voluble, and not very enticing, voice, in its rapid course through the subject on which the speaker is entering, with a resolute determination, as it seems, never to pause. You think of an express train, which does not stop even at the chief stations. On, on he speeds, in full reliance on his own momentum, never stopping for words, never stopping for thoughts, never halting for an instant, even to take breath—his intellect gathering new vigour as he proceeds, hauling the subject after him, and all its possible attributes and illustrations, with the strength of a giant, leaving a line of light on the pathway his mind has trod, till, unexhausted and apparently inexhaustible, he brings this remarkable effort to a close by a peroration, so highly sustained in its declamatory power, so abounding in illustration, so admirably framed to crown and clench the whole oration, that surprise, if it has even begun to wear off, kindles anew, and the hearer is left utterly prostrate and powerless by the whirlwind of ideas and emotions that has swept over him."

His Early Speeches.—Macaulay's first speech in Parliament was made on the Jewish Disabilities, in 1830, and was moderately successful; but in the following year his masterly speeches on the Reform Bill brought him to the front rank as an orator. Jeffrey, his colleague on the *Edinburgh*, who was also in Parliament, thus wrote to Lord Cockburn respecting Macaulay's speech on the second reading of the Bill:—"No division last night, as I predicted, and not a very striking debate. A curious series of prepared speeches by men who do not speak regularly, and far better expressed than nine-tenths of the good speeches, but languid and inefficient, from the air of preparation, and the want of nature and authority, with which they are spoken. There was but one exception, and it was a brilliant one. I mean Macaulay, who surpassed his former appearance in closeness,

fire, and vigour, and very much improved the effect of it, by a more steady and graceful delivery. It was prodigiously cheered, as it deserved, and I think puts him clearly at the head of the great speakers, if not the debaters, of the House. I once meant to have said something, but I now think it impossible." A session or two later, Jeffrey again wrote: "I breakfasted to-day at Rogers's with Macaulay and Sydney Smith! both in great force and undaunted spirit. Mac. is a marvellous person. He made the very best speech that has been made this session, on India, a few nights ago, to a House of less than fifty. The Speaker, who is a severe judge, says he rather thinks it the best speech he ever heard."—*Lord Cockburn's "Life of Jeffrey."*

The "Bray" of Exeter Hall.—This celebrated expression, which lost Macaulay his seat for Edinburgh, occurred in his speech on the second reading of the Maynooth College Bill, in April, 1845. The passage containing it is thus given in the edition of his speeches corrected by himself: "What substitute does the honourable baronet (Sir Robert Peel) give his followers to console them for the loss of their favourite Registration Bill? Even this Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth College. Was such a feat of legislation ever seen? And can we wonder that the eager, honest, hot-headed Protestants, who raised you to power in the confident hope that you would curtail the privileges of the Roman Catholics, should stare and grumble when you propose to give public money to the Roman Catholics? Can we wonder that, from one end of the country to the other, everything should be ferment and uproar; that petitions should, night after night, whiten all our benches like a snowstorm? Can we wonder that the people out of doors should be exasperated by seeing the very men who, when we were in office, voted against the old grant to Maynooth, now pushed and pulled into the House by your whippers-in to vote for an increased grant?

The natural consequences follow. All those fierce spirits, whom you hallooed on to harass us, now turn round and begin to worry you. The Orangeman raises his war-whoop: Exeter Hall sets up its bray: Mr. Macneile shudders to see more costly cheer than ever provided for the priests of Baal at the table of the Queen; and the Protestant Operatives of Dublin call for impeachments in exceedingly bad English. But what did you expect? Did you think, when, to serve your turn, you called the Devil up, that it was as easy to lay him as to raise him?"

Subscriptions to Race Meetings, &c. — During Macaulay's earlier connection with Edinburgh as one of its representatives, he was applied to for a subscription to the annual race meeting of the town, the sum of fifty guineas having usually been given under such circumstances. He declined to continue the practice, and thus expressed his views to his friend Mr. Adam Black: "In the first place, I am not clear that the object is a good one. In the next place, I am clear that by giving money for such an object in obedience to such a summons, I should completely change the whole character of my connection with Edinburgh. It has been usual enough for rich families to keep a hold on corrupt boroughs by defraying the expense of public amusements. Sometimes it is a ball; sometimes a regatta. The Derby family used to support the Preston races. The members for Beverley, I believe, find a bull for the constituents to bait. But these were not the conditions upon which I undertook to represent Edinburgh. In return for your generous confidence, I offer faithful parliamentary service, and nothing else. * * * The call that is now made is one so objectionable that I must plainly say, I would rather take the Chiltern Hundreds than comply with it. If our friends want a member who will find them in public diversions, they can be at no loss. I know twenty people who, if you will elect them to Parliament, will

gladly treat you to a race and a race-ball once a month. But I shall not be very easily induced to believe that Edinburgh is disposed to select her representatives on such a principle."

THE EARL OF MANSFIELD.

Secret of Success in Parliament.—Lord Chesterfield, in one of his letters to his son, thus wrote of Mansfield, then Mr. Murray, Solicitor-General:—"Your fate depends upon your success as a speaker, and take my word for it that success turns more upon manner than matter. Mr. Pitt and Mr. Murray are, beyond comparison, the best speakers. Why? Only because they are the best orators. They alone can inflame or quiet the House; they alone are attended to in that numerous and noisy assembly, that you might hear a pin fall while either of them is speaking. Is it that their matter is better, or their arguments stronger, than other people's? Does the House expect extraordinary information from them? Not in the least; but the House expects pleasure from them, and therefore attends; finds it, and therefore approves."

Pitt's Antagonism.—Throughout the whole course of Murray's career in the House of Commons, he was the invariable object of Pitt's unsparing invective. "Pitt," says Lord Waldegrave, "undertook the difficult task of silencing Murray, the Attorney-General, the ablest man, as well as the ablest debater, in the House of Commons." Dissimilarity of character, no less than of political principles, added bitterness to the eloquence of Pitt. Despising the policy and distrusting the principles of Murray, he eagerly availed himself of every occasion which presented itself of expressing his indignant sarcasms. Brilliant and argumentative as was the oratory of Murray, he did not always possess the nerve necessary to ward off or to

return assaults so terrible as these, and for the most part he bore, in agitated silence, the attacks to which he did not venture to make any reply. In a letter from Lord Holland, describing a speech just given, the writer says, "In both Mr. Pitt's speeches every word was *Murray*, yet so managed that neither he nor anybody else could or did take public notice of it, or in any degree reprehend him. I sat near Murray, who suffered for an hour."—*Roscoe's "Eminent British Lawyers."*

Mansfield's Powers in Debate.—One of the first occasions (says Roscoe) on which Lord Mansfield distinguished himself in the House of Lords, after his elevation to the peerage, was in the debate on the Bill for the Amendment of the Habeas Corpus Act. A gentleman having been impressed and confined in the Savoy, his friends applied for a writ of *habeas corpus;* but as the imprisonment was not for any criminal matter, it was found that the statute of 31 Car. II., c. 2, did not apply. This palpable deficiency in the law attracted the attention of some friends to liberty, who introduced a bill into the House of Commons for the purpose of extending the provisions of the statute of Charles II. to cases where the imprisonment was not upon any criminal charge. The bill passed the Lower House, but was violently opposed in the House of Lords by Lord Mansfield and Lord Hardwicke. The King himself talked openly against the bill at his levee, and the supporters of it were understood to incur his displeasure. * * * Such was the earnestness and so great the ingenuity and eloquence which Lord Mansfield exerted on the occasion that the bill was ultimately rejected. "The fate of the bill," says Horace Walpole, "which could not be procured by the sanction of the judges, Lord Mansfield was forced to take upon himself. He spoke for two hours and a half; his voice and manner, composed of harmonious solemnity, were the least graces of his speech.

I am not averse to own that I never heard so much argument, so much sense, so much oratory united. His deviations into the abstruse minutiæ of the law served but as a foil to the luminous parts of the oration. Perhaps it was the only speech which, in my time at least, had real effect; that is, convinced many persons; nor did I ever know how true a votary I was to liberty, till I found that I was not one of the number staggered by that speech."

HARRY MARTEN.

Drowsy Members.—Alderman Atkins, a member of the Long Parliament, made a motion that such scandalous members as slept, and minded not the business of the House, should be put out. Harry Marten, who was wont to sleep much in the House (at least dog-sleep), starts up:—"Mr. Speaker, a motion has been made to turn out the *noddcrs;* I desire the *noddees* may also be turned out."—*Aubrey MSS.*

The Fools and the Profane.—A godly member of the Long Parliament made a motion to have all profane and unsanctified persons expelled the House. Harry Marten stood up and moved that all fools should be put out likewise, and then there would be a thin House.—*Ibid.*

A Roland for an Oliver.—Oliver Cromwell once in the House called Harry Marten, either jestingly or scoffingly, "Sir Harry Marten." "I thank your majesty," said Marten, rising and bowing; "I always thought when you were King I should be knighted."—*Ibid.*

Spoiling a Martyr.—A curious pamphlet, republished in Lord Somers' Tracts, relates the condemnation to death of David Jenkins, Esq., a Welsh judge, and Sir Francis Butler, by a vote of the House of Commons. Jenkins, who was a stout Royalist, was brought before the Commons to answer a charge of having, in 1642,

condemned to death persons who had taken up arms against the King in the Welsh country. When desired to kneel at the bar of the House, the old judge peremptorily refused, saying, "Since you, Mr. Speaker, and this House have renounced all your duty and allegiance to your sovereign and natural liege lord, the King, and are become a den of thieves, should I bow myself in this house of Rimmon, the Lord would not pardon me in this thing." Intense excitement and confusion broke out amongst the members upon this plain speaking, and both prisoners were condemned to suffer death for high treason. Then uprose Harry Marten, and said, "Mr. Speaker, everyone must believe that this old gentleman here is fully possessed in his head that he is *pro aris et focis mori*, that he shall die a martyr for this cause, for otherwise he never would have provoked the House by such biting expressions; whereby it is apparent that if you execute him, you do what he hopes for and desires, and whose execution might have a great influence upon the people, since not condemned by a jury. Wherefore my motion is that this House would suspend the day of execution, and in the meantime force him to live in spight of his teeth." This motion restored the House to good humour; they agreed to it, and sent both prisoners off to Newgate. Marten had rightly divined the mind of the old judge. Mr. Jenkins in the retirement of his prison occupied himself in devising the details of the manner in which he should go to the scaffold. "He would eat much liquorice and gingerbread, thereby to strengthen his lungs, that he might extend his voice far and near; he would come with Bracton's book hung upon his left shoulder, with the statutes at large hung upon his right shoulder, and the Bible with a riband put round his neck, and hanging on his breast. So that when they should see him die, thousands would inquire into these matters, and having found all he should tell them to be true, they would come to loath and

detest the present tyranny." The elaborate programme of the old judge was, however, rendered nugatory, for his day of execution never arrived.

ANDREW MARVELL.

The Incorruptible.—Andrew Marvell was chosen by the electors of Hull, his native town, to represent them in Parliament, in the year 1660. The newly-elected member was in a pecuniary condition which compelled him to accept the wages at that time paid by constituents to their representatives. He was, says Cooke ("History of Party"), the last representative who received wages for the performance of parliamentary duties. The King, desirous to secure the powerful support of Marvell, sent Lord Danby, his Lord Treasurer, with offers of place and of money. The royal messenger found the object of his search occupying obscure apartments in a court near the Strand; but all his blandishments failed to produce any effect on the independent soul of Marvell. The Treasurer at parting—says a pamphlet which professes to give a minute record of the circumstances—slipped into Marvell's hand an order upon the Treasury for a thousand pounds, and was moving towards his carriage, when Marvell stopped him, and taking him again up-stairs, called his servant boy, when the following colloquy ensued:—"Jack, child, what had I for dinner yesterday?"—"Don't you remember, sir, you had the little shoulder of mutton, that you ordered me to bring from the woman in the market?"—"Very right, child; what have I for dinner to-day?"—"Don't you know, sir, that you bid me lay by the blade-bone to broil?"—"'Tis so, very right, child; go away. My lord, do you hear that Andrew Marvell's dinner is provided? There's your piece of paper; I want it not; I knew the sort of kindness you intended. I live

here to serve my constituents; the ministry may seek men for their purpose; I am not one."

Marvell and Milton.—The following statement appears in the "Parliamentary History" for 1660:—"Dec. 17th. The celebrated Mr. John Milton, having now laid long in custody of the sergeant-at-arms, was released by order of the House. Soon after Mr. Andrew Marvell complained that the sergeant had exacted £150 fees of Mr. Milton; which was seconded by Colonel King and Colonel Shapcot. On the contrary, Sir Heneage Finch observed that Milton was Latin Secretary to Cromwell, and deserved hanging. However, this matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges to examine and decide the difference." Milton had been ordered to be taken into custody on the 16th of June previous, and to be prosecuted by the Attorney-General for having written the "Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio" against Salmasius, and another book in answer to the "Icon Basilike."

LORD MELBOURNE.

Making Matters Agreeable.—Mr. Duncombe, in the "Life and Correspondence" of his father, states that the following story was circulated at the clubs, relative to the dismissal of the Melbourne ministry in 1834:—"His Majesty sent for Lord Melbourne while at Brighton; and on the latter proposing to proceed to business, the King, with his customary *bonhommie*, exclaimed, 'Come, come, we are going to dinner; let's talk of business afterwards!' Nothing loth, the ever agreeable First Lord accepted the royal hospitality, and did justice to it, revolving in his mind the propriety of making political hay while the royal luminary shone. He did equal justice to the nautical jokes and anecdotes, and was preparing to profit by his opportunity, when the King bluffly interrupted him:—'Fill your glass;

it's dry talking!' Lord Melbourne filled his glass, laughed at the command, and drank the wine, fully appreciating its excellence. There then followed more nautical jokes and more wine; and the Prime Minister enjoyed both, and was evidently in a disposition to enjoy everything—the sweets of office for an interminable tenancy included. The dinner had been cleared, the dessert placed upon the table, and the cheerfulness of his Majesty was only exceeded by the cheerfulness of his Minister. There could be no doubt at all that they were on the best possible understanding. The Premier was thinking on the main chance, while the Sailor King, appropriately enough, seemed to be thinking only of the main brace. So, fearful that he might lose his chance, after indulging in a thorough burst of mirth at the last contribution from the royal admiral's memory, Lord Melbourne was about to commence a request, when he was cut short by an abrupt change in the King's manner and speech. 'By the way,' said his Majesty, 'Lord Althorp's dead, I hear —so is the Government, of course; when the head's gone, the body can't get on at all; therefore there's no help for it—you must all resign. Here, my lord,' he added, as he took a letter from his pocket, and handed it to the astonished Prime Minister, 'here's a letter I've written to the Duke of Wellington, directing him to form a Cabinet. Be sure you give it him directly you arrive in town.' Lord Melbourne took the proffered document and his departure almost simultaneously, in rather a hazy state of mind—the anti-climax of the King's securing him as a messenger to bear the tidings of his dismissal to his successor, every now and then, as he journeyed to town, making him have recourse to a habit he had of scratching his head, while uttering an involuntary exclamation that did not sound like a blessing." Guizot, in his "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," thus notices the circumstance of the change of ministry:—"Lord Melbourne proceeded to Brighton to submit to the King the new

arrangements which this occurrence (the decease of Earl Spencer, and the consequent removal of his eldest son, Lord Althorp, to the House of Lords) rendered necessary. William IV. did not approve of them, but complained of some of his advisers, and expressed his intention to transfer the reins of government to other hands. Always cool and graceful in whatever position he might be placed, Lord Melbourne himself undertook to convey to the Duke of Wellington the letter in which the King empowered him to form a new Cabinet."

A Brief Reply.—The most crushing reply (says the *Quarterly Review*) that any assailant ever received was on an occasion when Lord Brougham closed one of his most brilliant displays with a diatribe against the Melbourne Government. Lord Melbourne's reply was comprised in a single sentence:—"My Lords, you have heard the eloquent speech of the noble and learned lord—one of the most eloquent he ever delivered in this House—and I leave your lordships to consider what *must be* the nature and strength of the objections which prevent any Government from availing themselves of the services of such a man."

Not so Bad as he Seemed.—The discussions in the House on Church matters in 1837 gave rise to the following observations on the policy and opinions of Lord Melbourne by the Rev. Sydney Smith:—"Viscount Melbourne declared himself quite satisfied with the Church as it is; but if the public had any desire to alter it, they might do as they pleased. He might have said the same thing of the Monarchy, or of any other of our institutions; and there is in the declaration a permissiveness and good humour which, in public men, has seldom been exceeded. * * But, if the truth must be told, our viscount is somewhat of an impostor. Everything about him seems to betoken careless desolation; any one would suppose from his manner that he was playing

at chuck-farthing with human happiness; that he was always on the heel of pastime; that he would giggle away the Great Charter, and decide by the method of teetotum whether my lords the Bishops should or should not retain their seats in the House of Lords. All this is the mere vanity of surprising and making us believe that he can play with kingdoms as other men can with ninepins. Instead of this lofty nebulo, this miracle of moral and intellectual felicities, he is nothing more than a sensible honest man, who means to do his duty to the sovereign and to the country. Instead of being the ignorant man he pretends to be, before he meets the deputation of Tallow-chandlers in the morning, he sits up half the night talking with Thomas Young about melting and skimming, and then, though he has acquired knowledge enough to work off a whole vat of prime Leicester tallow, he pretends next morning not to know the difference between a dip and a mould. * * * I believe him to be conscientiously alive to the good or evil that he is doing, and that this caution has more than once arrested the gigantic projects of the Lycurgus* of the Lower House."—*Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton.*

SIR THOMAS MORE.

The King Thwarted by a "Beardless Boy."—More was returned to the House of Commons in 1504, and he is recorded as the first member of that assembly who gained celebrity by public speaking, and who, as a successful leader of opposition, incurred the enmity of the Court. Henry was entitled (says Lord Campbell in his "Lives") according to the strictest feudal law to a grant on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter Margaret with James IV. of Scotland; but he thought it a favourable opportunity for gratifying his avarice, and he required a much

* Lord John Russell.

greater sum than he intended to bestow on the Scottish queen. When the consent of the Lower House was demanded, Sir Thomas, making a grave speech, pronounced such urgent arguments why these exactions were not to be granted, that thereupon all the King's demands were crossed, and his request denied; so that Mr. Tyler, one of the King's Privy Chamber, went presently from the House and told his Majesty that a beardless boy had disappointed him of his expectations. More, however, was twenty-four years of age when he made this effective speech.

Wolsey's Attempt to Overawe the Commons.—At this Parliament (1523) Cardinal Wolsey found himself much aggrieved with the burgesses thereof; for that nothing was so soon done or spoken therein, but that it was immediately blown abroad in every alehouse. It fortuned at that Parliament a very great subsidy to be demanded, which the Cardinal fearing would not pass the Commons' House, determined, for the furtherance thereof, to be there present himself. Before where coming, after long debating there, whether it was better but with a few of his lords, as the most opinion of the House was, or with his whole train royally to receive him; "Masters," quoth Sir Thomas More (the Speaker), "forasmuch as my lord Cardinal lately, ye wot well, laid to our charge the lightness of our tongues for things uttered out of this House, it shall not in my mind be amiss to receive him with all his pomp, with his maces, his pillars, his poll-axes, his hat, and great seal too; to the intent that if he find the like fault with us hereafter, we may be the bolder from ourselves to lay the blame on those whom his grace bringeth here with him." Whereunto the House wholly agreeing, he was received accordingly. Where, after he had, by a solemn oration, by many reasons, proved how necessary it was the demand then moved to be granted, and further showed that less would not serve to maintain the prince's purpose; he, seeing the company sitting still silent,

and thereunto nothing answering, and, contrary to his expectation, showing in themselves towards his request no towardness of inclination, said to them, "Masters, you have many wise and learned men amongst you, and sith I am from the King's own person sent hitherto unto you, to the preservation of yourselves and of all the realm, I think it meet you give me some reasonable answer." Whereat every man holding his peace then began (Wolsey) to speak to one Master Marney, afterwards Lord Marney. "How say you," quoth he, "Master Marney?" who making him no answer neither, he severally asked the same question of divers others, accounted the wisest of the company; to whom, when none of them all would give so much as one word, being agreed before, as the custom was, to give answer by their Speaker, "Masters," quoth the cardinal, "unless it be the manner of your House, as of likelihood it is, by the mouth of your Speaker, whom you have chosen for trusty and wise (as indeed he is), in such cases to utter your minds, here is, without doubt, a marvellously obstinate silence." And thereupon he required answer of Mr. Speaker; who first reverently, on his knees, excusing the silence of the House, abashed at the presence of so noble a personage, able to amaze the wisest and best learned in a realm, and then, by many probable arguments, proving that for them to make answer was neither expedient nor agreeable with the ancient liberty of the House; in conclusion for himself showed that though they had all with their voices trusted him, yet except every one of them could put into his own head their several wits, he alone in so weighty a matter was unmeet to make his grace answer. Whereupon the Cardinal, displeased with Sir Thomas More, that had not in this Parliament in all things satisfied his desire, suddenly arose and departed.—*Roper's "Life of More."*

Of One Mind.—When the short session of Parliament (just referred to) was closed, Wolsey, in his gallery

of Whitehall, said to More, "I wish to God you had been at Rome, Mr. More, when I made you Speaker." "Your grace not offended, so would I too, my lord," replied Sir Thomas, "for then should I have seen the place I long have desired to visit." More turned the conversation by saying that he liked this gallery better than the Cardinal's at Hampton Court. But the Cardinal secretly brooded over his revenge.—*Sir J. Mackintosh's "Life of More."*

THE FIRST DUKE OF NEWCASTLE.

A Living Caricature.—There is scarcely any public man in our history of whose manners and conversation so many particulars have been preserved. Single stories may be unfounded or exaggerated. But all the stories about him, whether told by people who were perpetually seeing him in Parliament and attending his levee in Lincoln's Inn Fields, or by Grub Street writers who never had more than a glimpse of his star through the windows of his gilded coach, are of the same character. Horace Walpole and Smollett differed in their tastes and opinions as much as two human beings could differ. They kept quite different society. Walpole played at cards with countesses, and corresponded with ambassadors. Smollett passed his life surrounded by printers' devils and famished scribblers. Yet Walpole's Duke and Smollett's Duke are as like as if they were both from one hand. Smollett's Newcastle runs out of his dressing-room with his face covered with soap-suds to embrace the Moorish envoy. Walpole's Newcastle pushes his way into the Duke of Grafton's sick room to kiss the old nobleman's plasters. No man was so unmercifully satirised. But in truth he was himself a satire ready made. All that the art of the satirist does for other men, nature had done for him. Whatever was absurd about him stood out with grotesque prominence from the rest of the

character. He was a living, moving, talking caricature. His gait was a shuffling trot; his utterance a rapid stutter; he was always in a hurry; he was never in time; he abounded in fulsome caresses and in hysterical tears. His oratory resembled that of Justice Shallow. It was nonsense effervescent with animal spirits and impertinence. Of his ignorance many anecdotes remain, some well authenticated, some probably invented at coffee-houses, but all exquisitely characteristic. "Oh—yes—yes—to be sure—Annapolis must be defended—troops must be sent to Annapolis—Pray where is Annapolis?"—"Cape Breton an island! wonderful! —show it me on the map. So it is, sure enough. My dear sir, you always bring us good news. I must go and tell the King that Cape Breton is an island." And this man was, during nearly thirty years, Secretary of State, and, during near ten years, First Lord of the Treasury!—*Macaulay on Horace Walpole.* Somebody said t'other day, "Yet sure the Duke of Newcastle does not want parts." "No," replied Lord Talbot, "for he has done without them for forty years."—*Walpole's Letters to Mann.*

The Duke and the Leadership of the Commons.—The Duke became First Lord of the Treasury on the death of his brother, Henry Pelham, in 1754. He had some difficulty in finding a leader of the House of Commons, and opened negotiations with Fox. Macaulay writes:—"The proposition which he made was that Fox should be Secretary of State, with the lead of the House of Commons; that the disposal of the secret service money, or, in plain words, the business of buying members of Parliament, should be left to the First Lord of the Treasury; but that Fox should be exactly informed of the way in which this fund was employed. To these conditions Fox assented. But the next day everything was in confusion. Newcastle had changed his mind. The conversation which took place between Fox and the Duke is one of the most curious in

English history. 'My brother,' said Newcastle, 'when he was at the Treasury, never told anybody what he did with the secret service money. No more will I.' The answer was obvious. Pelham had been not only First Lord of the Treasury, but also manager of the House of Commons; and it was therefore unnecessary for him to confide to any other person his dealings with the members of that House. 'But how,' said Fox, 'can I lead in the Commons without information on this head? How can I talk to gentlemen when I do not know which of them have received gratifications and which have not? And who,' he continued, 'is to have the disposal of places?' 'I myself,' said the Duke. 'How then am I to manage the House of Commons?' 'Oh, let the members of the House of Commons come to me!' Fox then mentioned the general election which was approaching, and asked how the ministerial boroughs were to be filled up. 'Do not trouble yourself,' said Newcastle; 'that is all settled.' This was too much for human nature to bear. Fox refused to accept the Secretaryship of State on such terms; and the Duke confided the management of the House of Commons to a dull, harmless man, whose name is almost forgotten in our time, Sir Thomas Robinson. * * * 'Sir Thomas Robinson lead us!' said Pitt to Fox. 'The Duke might as well send his jack-boot to lead us.'"—*Essay on Chatham.*

LORD NORTH.

A Pattern of Good Humour.—A few only of his sayings have reached us, and those, as might be expected, are rather things which he had chanced to coat over with some sarcasm or epigram that tended to preserve them; they consequently are far from giving an idea of his habitual pleasantry and the gaiety of thought which generally pervaded his speeches. Thus, when a vehement declaimer, calling aloud for his head, turned round and perceived his vic-

tim unconsciously indulging in a soft slumber, and, becoming still more exasperated, denounced the Minister as capable of sleeping while he ruined his country, the latter only complained how cruel it was to be denied a solace which other criminals so often enjoyed—that of having a night's rest before their fate. When surprised in a like indulgence during the performance of a very inferior artist, who, however, showed equal indignation at so ill-timed a recreation, he contented himself with observing how hard it was that he should be grudged so very natural a release from considerable suffering; but, as if recollecting himself, added that it was somewhat unjust in the gentleman to complain of him for taking the remedy which he had himself been considerate enough to administer. The same good humour and drollery quitted him not when in opposition. Every one has heard of the speech which, if it had failed to injure the objects of its attack, was very effectual in fixing a name on its honest and much respected author. On Mr. Martin's proposal to have a starling placed near the chair and taught to repeat the cry of "Infamous coalition!" Lord North coolly suggested that, as long as the worthy member was preserved to them, it would be a needless waste of the public money, since the starling might well perform his office by deputy.* —*Brougham's "Statesmen."* Earl Russell gives the following more concisely than Lord Brougham: "North's good humour and readiness were of admirable service to him when the invectives of his opponents would have discomfited a more serious Minister. He often indulged in real or seeming slumber; an opponent in the midst of an invective exclaimed, 'Even now, in the midst of these perils, the noble lord is asleep.' 'I wish to God I was,' rejoined Lord North. Alderman Sawbridge, having accom-

* "I submit that this House is in possession of a Martin, who will serve the purpose quite as well."—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

panied the presentation of a petition from Billingsgate with accusations of more than ordinary virulence, Lord North began his reply in the following words: 'I cannot deny that the hon. alderman speaks not only the sentiments, but the very language of his constituents.'"—*Earl Russell's "Life of Fox."*

Extracting a Compliment.—The assault of Mr. Adam on Mr. Fox, and of Colonel Fullarton on Lord Shelburne, had once put the House into the worst possible humour, and there was more or less savageness in everything that was said. Lord North deprecated the too great readiness to take offence which then seemed to possess the House. "One member," he said, "who spoke of me, called me 'that thing called a Minister.' To be sure," he said, patting his large form, "I am a thing; the member, therefore, when he called me a thing, said what was true; and I could not be angry with him. But when he added, 'that thing called a Minister,' he called me that thing which of all things he himself wished most to be, and therefore I took it as a compliment."—*Butler's "Reminiscences."*

Sleeping through the Centuries.—On an occasion when Colonel Barry brought forward a motion on the British navy, Lord North said to a friend of his who was sitting next him in the House, "We shall have a tedious speech from Barry to-night. I dare say he'll give us our naval history from the beginning, not forgetting Sir Francis Drake and the Armada. All this is nothing to me, so let me sleep on, and wake me when we come near our own times." His friend at length roused him, when Lord North exclaimed, "Where are we?" "At the battle of La Hogue, my lord." "Oh, my dear friend," he replied, "you have woke me a century too soon!"—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

A New Member.—Once, when speaking in the House, Lord North was interrupted by the barking of a dog which

had crept in. He turned round, and archly said, "Mr. Speaker, I am interrupted by a new member." The dog was driven out, but got in again, and recommenced barking, when Lord North, in his dry way, added, "Spoke once."—*Ibid.*

Fretting.—The Duke of Newcastle went to Lord North, at Bushey Park, to lament the miscarriage at Charleston (June 28th, 1776, during the War of Independence), and to inquire into his cousin Clinton's behaviour; but finding Lord North treat the affair with his usual indifference and jollity, took notice of it to him. "Faith, my lord," said Lord North, "if fretting would make me thin, I would be as sorry as your grace; but since it will not have that effect, I bear it as well as I can."—*Walpole's "Journals."*

Impudent Silence.—Colonel Luttrell moved in the House of Commons, April 12th, 1774, that the sheriffs of Middlesex should be called to answer at the bar for their conduct in summoning Wilkes instead of himself to serve in Parliament. After a long pause, Charles Fox rose and said Colonel Luttrell should not want a second; and then poured out a torrent of invective against Lord North for his pusillanimity, and for what he called his impudent and shameless silence. Lord North, with great quickness and humour, replied that he had never before heard of impudent silence; that he had, indeed, seen gentlemen on their legs whose shameless impudence had shocked all mankind.—*Ibid.*

Laughing at the Bankers.—At the meeting of Parliament, January 13th, 1774, when the Address was moved in the House of Commons, Mr. Prescott, a very rich banker, complained of the late regulation of the gold coin, by which, he said, there was not a banker in England that had not lost £500. Lord North laughed, and made the House laugh at him, by saying he was glad the loss had fallen on those who were the best able to bear it.—*Walpole's "George III."*

The Other Opposition.—During the American War of Independence, Lord North, at a City dinner, having announced the receipt of intelligence of an important advantage gained over the "rebels," and being taken to task by Charles Fox and Colonel Barré, who were present, for applying such language to "our fellow-subjects in America," exclaimed, with the inimitable talent for good-humoured raillery which distinguished him, "Well, then, to please you, I will call them *the gentlemen in opposition on the other side of the water.*" This has been told me as a traditionary anecdote not hitherto in print.—*Campbell's "Lives."*

A Reluctant Apology.—In one of the debates on the American war, in 1782, "Colonel Barré attacked Lord North violently, calling him the scourge of the country. Upon this Lord North, for almost the only time in his life, lost his temper, and said 'he had been used, from that quarter, to language so uncivil, so brutal, so insolent——' At these words the House got into an uproar, and Mr. T. Townshend called upon Lord North to apologise. Lord North said he was ready to ask pardon of the House, but not of Barré. At the end of a tumult of three hours, he consented to ask pardon even of Barré."—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

The Fall of Lord North.—In the session of 1782, the ministry of Lord North had several times narrowly escaped a vote of censure. "On the 20th of March," says Earl Russell, "Lord Surrey was to renew the motion in a different shape. When the day arrived, the House was remarkably crowded, and curiosity was on tiptoe to learn the event. Before Lord Surrey commenced, Lord North rose, and said he had some information to give to the House, which might make any further proceeding in the motion unnecessary, and might require an adjournment. Upon these words there was great confusion, many members calling out 'No adjournment!' some 'Lord Surrey! Lord Surrey!' and some 'Lord North! Lord North!' Upon this Mr. Fox

rose and moved, 'That Lord Surrey be now heard;' upon which, Lord North, with great quickness, said, 'And I rise to speak to that motion.' Lord North then said he could assure the House, with authority, that the present Administration was no more, and that his Majesty had come to the full determination of changing his ministers. He then took leave of the House as minister, thanking them for the honourable support they had given him during so long a course of years, and in so many trying situations. * * * Lord North had borne his elevation with modesty; he showed equanimity in his fall. A trifling circumstance evinced his good humour. On the evening when he announced his resignation to the House of Commons, snow was falling, and the weather was bitterly cold. Lord North kept his carriage. As he was passing through the greatcoat room of the House of Commons, many members (chiefly his opponents) crowded the passage. When his carriage was announced, he put one or two of his friends into it, and then, making a bow to his opponents, said, 'Good night, gentlemen; it is the first time I have known the advantage of being in the secret.' Mr. Adam, from whom I heard this anecdote, says in his memoranda, 'No man ever showed more calmness, cheerfulness, and serenity. The temper of his whole family was the same. I dined with him that day, and was witness to it.'"

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Introduction of the Repeal Question.—The year 1834 was rendered remarkable by the introduction of the Repeal question into the House of Commons. O'Connell told me he was forced to take this step bitterly against his will. "I felt," said he, "like a man who was going to jump into a cold bath, but I was obliged to take the plunge."—*Daunt's "O'Connell."*

A Wonderful Shower of Rain.—In the session of 1833, a speech of Mr. Daniel O'Connell's, upon an Irish question of considerable interest and importance, was not only grievously abbreviated (by the reporter), but the sense of it entirely perverted in several passages. As I recollect, it was a speech on the then very exciting and difficult subject of the tithes of the Protestant Church in Ireland; and Mr. O'Connell, among other things, was made to say that he would vote in a certain way on the immediate point under consideration, "although it was directly in the teeth of all his former opinions on the subject!" On his bringing the matter before the House, under the usual form of a "Breach of Privilege," and making complaint of being thus treated, the defence set up by the reporter was that, during his walk from the House to the newspaper office, the rain, which was falling heavily at the time, had most unfortunately streamed into his pocket and washed out the notes he had made of Mr. O'Connell's speech. Upon which the latter remarked that it was the most extraordinary shower of rain he had ever heard of, inasmuch as it had not only *washed out* the speech he did make, but had *washed in* another, and an entirely different one.—*John O'Connell's "Parliamentary Experiences."*

Parodies.—Some of O'Connell's parodies and poetical applications in debate caught the humour of the House, and were considered felicitous. Amongst these was his sneer at the smallness of Lord Stanley's personal adherents after some general election:—

> "Thus down thy hill, romantic Ashbourne, glides
> The Derby dilly, carrying six insides."

His celebrated parody on three very excellent, and certainly good-humoured, members of Parliament, Colonels Sibthorp, Perceval, and Verner, was extremely ready, and produced a roar:—

"Three colonels, in three distant counties born,
Lincoln, Armagh, and Sligo, did adorn.
The first in matchless impudence surpassed,
The next in bigotry—in both, the last.
The force of nature could no further go—
To beard the third, she shaved the other two."

Two of these gentlemen looked as if they never needed a razor, and the third (Sibthorp) as if he repudiated one.—*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

His Aversion to Duels.—O'Connell was not sufficiently guarded in his language when speaking of other men, and on one occasion some one opposite to him said, "Such language might provoke a duel." "Oh, no," remarked O'Connell, pointing to one of his hands with the other; "there's too much blood upon this hand already." I heard him say this, and the effect, as he suited the action to the word, was very great.—*Professor Pryme.* O'Connell here referred to the incident of his duel with D'Esterre, which is thus related by Phillips, in "Curran and his Contemporaries":—"In one of his many mob-speeches, O'Connell called the Corporation of Dublin a 'beggarly corporation.' A gentleman named D'Esterre affected to feel this as a personal affront, he being one of that very numerous body, and accordingly fastened a quarrel on the offender. It is quite true that O'Connell endeavoured to avoid the encounter. He did not do enough. He should have summoned D'Esterre before the tribunals of the country, after failing to appease him by a repeated declaration that he meant him no personal offence, and could not, he being a total stranger to him. * * * However, on the occasion in question he showed a total absence of what is vulgarly called fear; indeed, his fixed determination was remarkable. Let those who read the following anecdote remember that he most reluctantly engaged in the combat; that he was then the father of seven children; and that it was an alternative of life or death with him, D'Esterre being

reputed an unerring marksman. Being one of those who accompanied O'Connell, he beckoned me aside to a distant portion of the very large field, which had a slight covering of snow. 'Phillips,' said he to me, 'this seems not a personal, but a political affair. I am obnoxious to a party, and they adopt a false pretence to cut me off. I shall not submit to it. They have reckoned without their host, I promise you. I am one of the best shots in Ireland at a mark, having, as a public man, considered it a duty to prepare, for my own protection, against such unprovoked aggression as the present. Now remember what I say to you. I may be struck myself, and then skill is out of the question; but if I am not, my antagonist will have cause to regret his having forced me into this conflict.' The parties were then very soon placed on the ground, at, I think, twelve paces distance; each having a case of pistols, with directions to fire when they chose, after a given signal. D'Esterre rather agitated himself by making a short speech, disclaiming all hostility to his Roman Catholic countrymen, and took his ground, somewhat theatrically, crossing his pistols upon his bosom. They fired almost together, and instantly on the signal. D'Esterre fell, mortally wounded. There was the greatest self-possession displayed by both."

Wanted, a Bellman.—At the Clare election, to the horror of Vesey Fitzgerald, the rival candidate, and a member of the then administration, Daniel (with the aid of his priests) polled tenant against landlord. * * * Vesey, a lord in embryo, could not stand it, and he fled. Next day was a great day for Daniel. Priest, curate, coadjutor, bishop—he who, with no franchise, had voted notwithstanding; and he who, having one, had voted *very often*—the whole available population, the pure children of nature as he called them, and some of them most justly, hailed their champion as he shouted from the hustings, "Boys, where's Vasy Vigarald? Och hone, Vasy, but it's me that's dull

without ye. *Righi, mavourneen / righi,** and send the bell about for him. Here's the cry for you—

'Stolen or strayed,
Lost or mislaid,
The President of the Board of Trade.'"

—*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

Scorning Advantage.—During a Dublin election, where Mr. West was a candidate, O'Connell resorted to his nicknames, and "sow West" and "ugly West" were lavished liberally. "Gentlemen," said West, good humouredly, "Mr. O'Connell takes advantage of me, for he wears a wig." "I scorn all advantage," exclaimed Daniel, casting off the ornament, and exhibiting a scalp literally without a hair between it and heaven—"I scorn all advantage; compare us now, boys; is sow West the beauty?"—*Ibid.*

An Unexpected Opponent.—Fagan, in his "Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell," relates an incident that occurred during the canvass of the constituency of the county of Kerry, when the "Liberator's" nephew was a candidate for the representation. Daniel spoke from the balcony of the Chamber of Commerce in Tralee one day, and opposite him were the committee rooms of the Knight of Kerry. In the midst of a very powerful speech a donkey suddenly began to bray. The effect was most ludicrous. Every man, woman, and child tittered, while the Conservative gentlemen roared aloud. Placid and collected, however, O'Connell looked around. A smile lighted up his face; and, raising his voice to its fullest pitch, he cried out, "Hear him! hear him, boys! 'tis the chairman of the Knight of Kerry's committee."

Jupiter Relenting.—The following is related by C. Phillips, as illustrative of the arbitrary disposition of the great Repealer:—"On a matter of parliamentary inquiry, on which I had quite as much experience as himself, our

* "Run, darling! run!"

judgments differed, and I fared accordingly. No one could ever tell, however, when the storm might arise; but he had it ready, and often nursed it in smiles. After walking down with me to the House of Commons one evening, arm-in-arm, as friendly as possible, he vehemently assailed me on the subject alluded to. He refused to retract. No alternative was left but to right myself, which was done in a way by no means to his satisfaction. After my excellent friend Colonel Perceval, in his place in Parliament, read my letter of reply, Daniel fell into one of his paroxysms. "The gallant member," said he, "may now congratulate himself on having severed a friendship of twenty-five years' standing." Friendship indeed! His translation of the *idem velle et idem nolle* must have been a curiosity. For six months and upwards, when we met, his look was a wild glare. At last it pleased his Jupitership to relent. He walked up to me one day in the Reform Club, in high good humour: "Charles, shake hands; I'm tired not speaking to you. I *forgive you!*"

The Mob Orator.—The following fragment on O'Connell is given by Bulwer in his "St. Stephen's":—

"Had that fierce railer sprung from English sires,
His creed a Protestant's, his birth a squire's,
No blander Pollio, whom our Bar affords,
Had graced the woolsack and cajoled My Lords.
Pass by his faults, his art be here allowed—
Mighty as Chatham, give him but a crowd;
Hear him in Senates, second-rate at best,
Clear in a statement, happy in a jest;
Sought he to shine, then certain to displease;
Tawdry, yet coarse-grained, tinsel upon frieze.
His Titan strength must touch what gave it birth;
Hear him to mobs, and on his mother earth!"

FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

A Hustings Speech Plagiarised.—Perhaps the queerest election that occurred in the three kingdoms (1832-33) was that of Feargus O'Connor, for the county of

Cork. In his canvass he was assisted by his cousin, O'Neill Daunt, then standing, and afterwards elected, for the borough of Mallow. Between them both the plan of taking county and borough aristocrats simultaneously by surprise had been concocted and carried out with infinite cleverness; but Daunt, although very far superior to O'Connor in information, tastes, habits of life, and general ability, was no match for him in dexterity. He had a lamentable proof of it on one occasion in particular, when, as both stood on the hustings, Daunt, to his dismay and horror, had to listen while Feargus delivered, *ore rotundo*, and greatly to the admiration of the multitude, the very speech that Daunt himself had most carefully prepared for that particular occasion; Feargus having, during their journey to the place of meeting, most industriously and successfully *pumped* his unsuspecting companion of his tropes and topics, and, in short, all his treasured eloquence.—*John O'Connell's "Parliamentary Recollections."*

The Chartist Petition of 1848.—On the 10th of April the Houses of Parliament, says the *Annual Register*, were filled with police, and, for the preservation of the peace, the streets were guarded by 170,000 special constables. The petition, which was to have been carried in procession from Kennington Common to Westminster, was transported by the less ostentatious medium of several cabs. Feargus O'Connor, in presenting it to the House, stated that it bore 5,706,000 signatures; but a strict scrutiny reduced these figures to the still very respectable total of 1,900,000. The Marquis of Lansdowne, in answer to a question in the House of Lords, said, "The meeting which was attempted to be held to-day on Kennington Common was dispersed by the police only, without the assistance or even the presence of a single soldier." Lord Brougham held that "those meetings that are called, whether in England or in Ireland, 'monster meetings,' are, in themselves, essentially illegal."

MR. BERNAL OSBORNE.

THE "STORMY PETREL OF DEBATE."—The nature of Mr. Bernal Osborne's appearances in parliamentary strife caused this name to be applied to him many years ago. One of the most effective passages in his peculiar vein occurred in the great debate on the conduct of the Government with respect to Denmark, in July, 1864. Mr. Osborne thus alluded to Lord Palmerston and his Cabinet:—"The noble lord and the gentlemen on the Treasury Bench are men of great capacity, but a little past their time, and they bungle a little; but if they wish to put the country in a proper position with foreign powers, and restore the just influence of England, it might be easily done by their imitating that custom which is obligatory on unsuccessful officials in Japan. If, sir, they would enact, in a modified form, that 'happy despatch' which we have learnt from the Asiatics, I am sure this country would at once regain its proper position. * * There sits the noble lord. *Sedet, æternumque sedebit.* I was about to add, but it would not be true—*infelix.* I wish to speak of him with every respect, because I believe that a more active or a more able man never existed in this country. (General cheers.) It is said of him that

'Panting time toils after him in vain.'

He is certainly *facile princeps*, the liveliest, if not the youngest, on the Treasury Bench. The noble lord deserves great credit for his admirable management through so long a time of the affairs of this House. He has acted with all sorts of men, and agreed with all sorts of opinions. These are great feats, but what is his policy? Sir, his domestic policy, not to go beyond the line of debate, is paternal but stationary; his foreign policy up to this day has been pugnacious but progressive. * * I have not been unfair

to the noble lord; but now let us go into his Cabinet. His Cabinet is a museum of curiosities. There, sir, are to be found some birds of rare and noble plumage, both alive and stuffed. (Great laughter.) But, unfortunately, there is a difficulty in keeping up the breed. For those Whig birds have been very barren, and they were obliged to take a cross with the famous Peelite breed. * * Certainly it cannot be said, either by their enemies or friends, that they have been prolific of measures since they have taken office. Even my right hon. friend (Mr. M. Gibson)—who is not connected with them by family, and somehow got into the Cabinet, but, like the fly in amber, 'one wonders how the devil he got there'—has not been fertile. I must say that his hon. friends the members for Rochdale and Birmingham are, I think, disappointed in this 'young man from the country.' When he married into the family we expected some liberal measures, but the right hon. gentleman has become indolent, and almost quarrelsome, under the guidance of the noble lord. Well, sir, what is to be done? We know by the traditions of the great Whig party that they will cling to the vessel, if not like shipwrecked sailors, like those testaceous marine animals which somehow adhere to the bottom, thereby clogging the engines and impeding the progress. Sir, should a vote of this House displace that administration, what are the Liberal party to do? Well, my advice to them is that they may feel perfectly happy as to the issue of this great duel which is being fought. They are somewhat in the situation of Iago in the play, and may say like him, 'Whether Cassio kills Roderigo, or Roderigo kills Cassio, or each kills the other,' they must gain."—*Times' Report.*

LORD PALMERSTON.

Entrance into Parliament.—The first constituency Lord Palmerston aspired to represent in the House of Com-

mons was that of the University of Cambridge, for which he was nominated in 1806, and again in 1807, but proved on both occasions unsuccessful. The earlier of these events is alluded to by Byron, in "Hours of Idleness," in the following doggerel stanza:—

> "Then would I view each rival wight,
> Petty and Palmerston survey;
> Who canvass there, with all their might,
> Against the next elective day."

His lordship, however, was returned for the borough of Newport (I. W.) at the general election in 1807, but his name does not occur in "Hansard" as a speaker till the following year.

Attempt to Assassinate him.—The attempt to assassinate Lord Palmerston is thus related in a letter from the Rev. A. Harris to Lord Fitzharris, given in the "Malmesbury Correspondence":—"April 8th, 1818. I have just seen Palmerston after this horrible attempt to assassinate him. He has received a contusion upon the back-bone, but not a very severe one, and there is not the least reason for alarm. His escape was a very narrow one. The assassin, whose name is Davis, and who had been an officer in Spain, met him upon the staircase at the War Office, and was quite close to him when he fired; the ball penetrated his coat and waistcoat about the middle of his spine, and glanced off. Palmerston walked on to the room where his secretary was sitting, and told him that he had been shot at, but did not know what injury he had received. Astley Cooper, and another surgeon of the name of Lynn, came immediately, and found the flesh upon the back-bone contused, but that the ball had not penetrated the skin. The ball was found upon the staircase. The surgeons conveyed Palmerston home. Meanwhile the assassin was seized by two messengers and put into safe custody. Palmerston told me that he knew him to be mad, and for that reason had

declined seeing him, having received two letters lately asking him to do so." Lord Palmerston thus jocularly refers to the occurrence in a letter to Lord Malmesbury a few days afterwards:—"After all, I am not half so sore as either Don Quixote or Sancho, upon many occasions in their adventures. * * * One comfort is that I shall be recorded in illustrious company, as having had the same escape as the Duke of Wellington and the Regent; but I have so far the advantage of the latter that my bullet *has* been found, though, luckily, *not in me.*"

A Three-decker.—In Canning's lifetime the oratorical and debating powers of his colleague had lain dormant. The Prime Minister once even spoke with regret of the loss he sustained through the silence of his Secretary at War. "What would I give"—he exclaimed, when wearied with assaults from the Opposition benches—"what would I give to get that three-decker, Palmerston, to bear down upon them."—*Westminster Review.*

"Judicious Bottle-holding."—On the 18th of November, 1851, Lord Palmerston, as Foreign Minister, received deputations from the borough of Finsbury and the parish of Islington, who presented addresses congratulating his lordship on the aid he had rendered the Sultan of Turkey in effecting the liberation of Kossuth. The Foreign Secretary declared himself highly gratified by such an expression of opinion on the part of so large a number of his fellow-countrymen; and, in alluding to the difficulties which were felt in the conduct of foreign affairs, he said (*Times* report), "a great deal of good generalship and judgment was required, and during the pending struggle a good deal of judicious bottle-holding was obliged to be brought into play." The phrase formed the subject of a characteristic cartoon for *Punch* shortly after it was uttered.

"Civis Romanus Sum."—The celebrated application of this phrase by Lord Palmerston occurred in the House of

Commons on the 25th of June, 1850. The occasion was the debate on a vote of confidence in the foreign policy of Lord John Russell's Government, with especial reference to the affairs of Greece. Lord Palmerston, as the minister whose acts were immediately in question, entered into an elaborate defence of his entire foreign policy, and, after speaking for five hours, closed his peroration with a passage which is thus given in "Hansard":—"I contend that we have not in our foreign policy done anything to forfeit the confidence of the country. We may not, perhaps, in this matter or in that, have acted precisely up to the opinions of one person or of another—and hard indeed it is, as we all know by our individual and private experience, to find any number of men agreeing entirely in any matter on which they may not be equally possessed of the details of the facts, and circumstances, and reasons, and conditions which led to action. But, making allowances for those differences of opinion which may fairly and honourably arise among those who concur in general views, I maintain that the principles which can be traced through all our foreign transactions, as the guiding rule and directing spirit of our proceedings, are such as deserve approbation. I therefore fearlessly challenge the verdict which this House, as representing a political, a commercial, a constitutional country, is to give on the question now brought before it—whether the principles on which the foreign policy of her Majesty's Government has been conducted, and the sense of duty which has led us to think ourselves bound to afford protection to our fellow-subjects abroad, are proper and fitting guides for those who are charged with the government of England; and whether, as the Roman, in days of old, held himself free from indignity when he could say *Civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of

England will protect him against injustice and wrong." Sir Robert Peel, although speaking against the vote of confidence, remarked of Lord Palmerston's defence, amid the cheers of the House, "His speech made us all proud of the man who delivered it."

The Minister of England.—After the House of Lords had passed its vote of censure on the foreign policy of Lord John Russell's Administration, the Premier remarked of his Foreign Secretary:—"So long as we continue the government of this country, I can answer for my noble friend that he will act, not as the minister of Austria, or as the minister of Russia, or of France, or of any other country, but as the minister of England." The observation has sometimes been thought mere tautology; but it was not so considered by Sir Robert Peel, who thus referred to it in a subsequent debate:—"The noble lord said that his noble friend the Secretary for Foreign Affairs would not be the minister of Austria, would not be the minister of Russia, and would not be the minister of France, but would be the minister of England. What was the meaning of that declaration? The noble lord has too much prudence and discretion to point a sarcasm against three of the greatest Powers of Europe; but he could afford to be very liberal with such weapons when directed against his predecessors. My construction of that passage was, that the noble lord meant to contrast the conduct of the noble lord the member for Tiverton with the conduct of the Earl of Aberdeen."—*Hansard.*

His Dismissal from the Foreign Secretaryship.—When Lord Palmerston was dismissed from Lord John Russell's Government, for having expressed to the French Ambassador his approval of the *coup d'état*, the ministerial explanations respecting the event were anxiously awaited by the country. They were given immediately on the assembling of Parliament, February 3rd, 1852, in the debate

on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. Lord John made an elaborate statement to the House, in the course of which he thus explained his reasons for the course he had felt compelled to adopt:—"The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, putting himself in the place of the Crown, neglected and passed by the Crown, in order to give his own opinion with respect to the state of affairs in France. Now, it struck me that a Secretary of State, constitutionally, has no such power. It appears to me that he can only act with the sanction and the authority of the Crown in matters of very great importance. In matters of small importance I am ready to admit that the Secretary of State must be allowed to take a course which to him seems best, without a continual reference to the Crown; but in this matter, which was of the utmost importance—namely, that of giving the moral influence and support of England to the act of the President of the French Republic—it seems to me that it was an affair so great that the opinion, not only of the Prime Minister, but of the Cabinet, should have been taken, and that no such opinion should have been expressed without their concurrence, and without the sanction of the Crown. * * * When this took place, as I conceived the authority of the Crown had been set aside, and set aside for a purpose which the Government could not sanction, it appeared to me that I had no other course than to inform my noble friend that, while I held office, he could no longer hold the seals of the Foreign Office." Lord Palmerston's statement in his own justification was to the effect that the communication complained of had been made in a non-official conversation with the French Ambassador. He held that "if the doctrine of the noble lord were established, and if the Foreign Secretary were to be precluded from expressing on passing events any opinion to a Foreign Minister, except in the capacity of an organ of a previously consulted Cabinet, there would be

an end to that freedom of intercourse between Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Ministers, which tends so much to good understanding and to the facility of public business."

Overthrow of the Russell Administration.—Lord Palmerston speedily avenged himself upon the Government from which he had been dismissed. On the 20th of February—only a week or two after the debate just mentioned—Lord John Russell moved for leave "to bring in a Bill to amend the laws respecting the Local Militia." Lord Palmerston proposed some amendments to the motion, the chief being to omit the word "local." He made a powerful speech, one of his most telling points being as follows:—"The whole of the objections of the Government to the formation of a regular militia are founded upon a radical distrust of the people of the United Kingdom. * * * Sir, there is no foundation for this distrust; there is no reason to believe that the people of England would not rally round the national standard. It will not be for the first time that the people of Scotland will have risen up in arms and have fought the enemies of the United Kingdom; and if it be that we cannot trust the people of Ireland to be faithful and true to their Queen and country, why, sir, let us at once send for a Russian force to defend us, or let us have an Austrian garrison in London. Let us hide our heads in shame and confusion; let us confess that England is no longer England; that her people are no longer endowed with that spirit and courage which sustained them in times gone by; and that they will not take up arms in their own defence, in defence of their homes and their families, of their Sovereign and their country. Such seems to be the idea of the framers of this Bill." On a division as to the word "local," the Government were defeated by 136 votes against 125, and Ministers immediately resigned.

The Indefatigable.—Professor Pryme relates the following in illustration of his well-known capacity for mental labour:—"One night, after a very late division, we were walking up Parliament Street together, when just opposite Downing Street he said to me, 'I must leave you here, for I have a despatch to revise at the Foreign Office.' I expressed some surprise at his continuing his labours so far into the night, and he replied that he frequently did so."

His Début in the Premiership.—When he found himself at the head of the Cabinet, and leader of the House, he discovered that even his long experience of that body had not rendered him familiar with many of its usages. * * * He set himself to learn the routine of his new position with the same patient industry with which, more than forty years before, he had mastered the details of the War Office. Early and late was the Premier in his place; one of the first to come, one of the last to leave. Day after day saw him there before half-past four. Night after night did the summer morning find him still at his place. His first appearance as leader of the House of Commons was not entirely successful; but by the end of the session of 1855 he had effectually grappled with and overcome the difficulty. He continued the practice he thus commenced during the whole period of his Premiership.—*Edinburgh Review.*

Happy Quotation.—Lord Palmerston was often peculiarly happy in the quotations with which he enforced an argument or illustrated a position in debate; and these not unfrequently culled rather from the byeways than from the highways of literature. One instance may be mentioned. During a discussion on the style of architecture to be adopted for the new law courts, his lordship was maintaining the propriety of admitting a plentiful supply of natural light into the obscure and knotty questions of law, and of giving to the gentlemen of the long robe scope and verge

enough to facilitate their movements from court to court. "We have all heard," he said, "of

> 'Rich windows that exclude the light,
> And passages that lead to nothing.'"

These architectural features to which his lordship referred were characteristics of that ancient pile where in former times—

> "My grave Lord Keeper led the brawls,
> The seal and maces danced before him,"

but he, for one, did not think it desirable that they should be repeated too often at the present day.

MR. PEASE.

The First Quaker in Parliament.—A curious difficulty (says Professor Pryme) occurred in the session 1832. A Quaker (J. Pease, jun.) was returned as the Whig member for the southern division of Durham. When he came to the table to be sworn, previously to taking his seat, he claimed to *affirm* instead of taking the oaths. The Speaker requested him to withdraw, and Lord Althorp moved that a committee be appointed to consider whether the Act of Parliament permitting affirmation in certain cases extended to this one. Their report, presented a few days after, was in favour of it, and the motion was agreed to unanimously. But another difficulty presented itself. It was a rule that the hat might be kept on when a member remained sitting, but must be taken off when moving in the house, and this dilemma was certain to occur daily. Some friend of Mr. Pease, to obviate this, instructed the doorkeeper gently to remove his hat and retain it till he quitted the house. In the course of a year or two he put it on and off for himself. It might have been thought that an individual of these peculiar habits would not have felt at home in such an assembly, but

this was not the case, and the feeling of *bonhommie* which generally prevailed in this "best and pleasantest Club," as my friend Hope Vere designated it, placed him perfectly at his ease. As a proof of it I will relate the following anecdote. After the termination of Peel's short administration, when several of us were in the library of the House, writing letters or conversing on the formation of Lord Melbourne's Ministry, one of those present jocosely asked Mr. Pease what place *he* was to have. He answered, "There is but one place that I could think of taking, and it has not been offered to me." "What is that?" we exclaimed, and he replied, "Of course, the Secretary at War."—*Pryme's "Recollections."*

A Variety.—Mr. Lalor, M.P. for Queen's County, is said to have snatched the occasion for a pun in his own plain country dialect, from the circumstance of seeing Mr. Pease, the Quaker member for Darlington, and the late Mr. Baines, M.P. for Leeds, come into the House together. "Oh," said he, "we are well off now, for here we have *Paas and Baans* (peas and beans) at the same time."—*John O'Connell's "Recollections."*

SIR ROBERT PEEL.

A Paternal Caution.—An anecdote which I have from good authority would give reason for believing that Sir Robert Peel had been long and naturally inclined to the tendency to which he yielded when, after having been a stubborn Conservative, he became an ardent reformer. It is said that in 1809, when he entered the House of Commons, his father, old Sir Robert Peel, went to Lord Liverpool and said to him: "My son, you may be sure, is a young man of rare talent, and will one day play an important part; but I know him well; at bottom his tendencies are Whig. If we do not immediately enlist him in our

ranks, he will escape from us ; give him something to do, he will serve you well, but you must make sure of him without delay."—*Guizot's "Memoirs of Peel."*

Father and Son.—On the appointment of a committee to inquire into the state of the Bank of England and the resumption of cash payments in 1819, Mr. Peel became chairman, and in that capacity he brought up the report, and proposed the resolutions it embodied. "His speech," writes Mr. G. H. Francis, "was heralded by one of those dramatic incidents which are so rare in our public proceedings; rare, perhaps, because they really exercise so slight an influence on the conduct of our public men. His father, Sir Robert Peel, in presenting a petition from merchants of the City of London against the proposed change in the currency laws, alluded to the relative positions of himself and his son with respect to the question. Speaking with much emotion, but with the unpretending frankness which marked his parliamentary conduct, he said: 'To-night I shall have to oppose a very near and dear relative. But while it is my own sentiment that I have a duty to perform, I respect those who do theirs, and who consider that duty to be paramount to all other considerations. I have mentioned the name of Mr. Pitt. My own impression is certainly a strong one in favour of that great man. All of us have some bias, and I always thought him the first man in the country. I well remember, when the near and dear relative I have alluded to was a child, I observed to some friends that the man who discharged his duty to his country in the manner Mr. Pitt had done, was the man of all the world to be admired, and the most to be imitated; and I thought at that moment that if my life, and that of my dear relative, should be spared, I would one day present him to his country to follow in the same path. It is very natural that such should be my wish, and I will only say further of him, that, though he is deviating from the proper

path in this instance, his head and heart are in the right place, and I think they will soon recall him to the right way.' The son did not pass unnoticed this allusion of his father. At the close of an able and powerful speech, in which he had explained his own reasons for a change of opinion, and the general views of the committee, he said: 'Many other difficulties presented themselves to me in discussing this question: among them is one which it pains me to observe—I mean the necessity I am under of opposing myself to an authority to which I have always bowed from my youth up, and to which I hope I shall always continue to bow with deference. My excuse is now, that I have a great public duty imposed upon me, and that, whatever may be my private feelings, from that duty I must not shrink.'"—*Francis's "Critical Biography of Peel."*

"What is a Pound?"—In supporting his resolutions on the occasion just referred to, Mr. Peel said, as reported in "Hansard": "The main question is this, Can we go on safely without a standard of value? All the witnesses examined by the committee agreed that we could not, except one, a Mr. Smith; who, on being asked if there should be no standard, said he would retain the 'pound.' Upon being further asked, What is a pound? he said it was difficult to explain, but that there was no gentleman in England who did not know what a pound was! He added that a pound was a standard which had existed in this country eight hundred years—three hundred years before the introduction of gold coin! I confess" (continued Mr. Peel) "that I can form no idea of a pound or a shilling, as detached from a definite quantity of the precious metals. I have the same difficulties to encounter as had Martinus Scriblerus in following the metaphysical speculations of his tutor, the philosophic Crambe. Being asked if he could form an idea of a universal man, he replied that he conceived him to be a knight of the shire, or the burgess of a corporation, who

represented a great number of individuals, but that he could form no other idea of a universal man. Further to puzzle him, he was asked if he could not form the universal idea of a lord mayor. To which he replied, that never having seen but one lord mayor, the idea of that lord mayor always returned to his mind, and that he had therefore great difficulty to abstract a lord mayor from his gold chain and furred gown; and that, moreover, unfortunately the only time he ever saw a lord mayor he was on horseback, and that the horse on which he rode, consequently, not a little disturbed his imagination. Upon this, says the history, Crambe, like the gentleman who can form an abstract idea of a pound, swore that he could frame a conception of a lord mayor, not only without his horse, gown, and gold chain, but even without stature, feature, colour, hands, feet, or any body whatever; and this, he contended, was the true universal idea of a lord mayor."

Finality in Reform.—Sir Robert Peel, addressing the electors of Tamworth in 1834, stated that he "considered the Reform Bill a final and irrevocable settlement of a great constitutional question—a settlement which no friend to the peace and welfare of this country would attempt to disturb, either by direct or by insidious means."—*Annual Register.*

"Register, Register, Register!"—Addressing the electors at the Tamworth election dinner, August 7th, 1837, Sir Robert Peel said: "It may be disagreeable, and, indeed, inconvenient to attend to the registration of voters which annually takes place throughout the country. All this may be revolting; but you may depend upon it that it is better you should take that trouble than that you should allow the constitution to become the victim of false friends, or that you should be trampled under the hoof of a ruthless democracy. The advice which has been given by some persons was, 'Agitate, agitate, agitate!' The advice which I

give you is this—Register, register, register!"—*Opinions of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel.*

An Honourable Distinction.—In a speech at Merchant Tailors' Hall, May 11th, 1835, Sir Robert Peel said: "Gentlemen,—Will you allow me to recall to your recollection what was the grand charge against myself—that the King had sent for the son of a cotton-spinner to Rome, in order to make him Prime Minister of England. Did I feel that by any means a reflection on me? Did that make me at all discontented with the state of the laws and institutions of the country? No; but does it not make me, and ought it not to make you, gentlemen, do all you can to reserve to other sons of other cotton-spinners the same opportunities, by the same system of laws under which this country has so long flourished, of arriving by the same honourable means at the like distinction?"

Catholic Emancipation.—On the 5th of March, 1829, Peel proposed, in the House of Commons, the abolition of the political and civil disabilities which weighed upon the Catholics. Two cruel charges were brought against him —tergiversation and fear. He repelled them with candid and high-minded good sense. "I cannot," he said, "purchase the support of my honourable friends by promising to adhere at all times and at all hazards, as minister of the Crown, to arguments and opinions which I may have heretofore propounded in this House. I reserve to myself, distinctly and unequivocally, the right of adapting my conduct to the exigencies of the moment and to the wants of the country. This has been the conduct of all former statesmen, at all times and in all countries." And, with regard to the charge of yielding to intimidation: "In my opinion," he said, "no motive can be more justly branded as ignominious than that which is usually termed cowardice. But there is a temper of mind much more dangerous than this, though it may not be so base; I mean the fear of

being thought to be afraid. Base as a coward is, the man who abandons himself to the fear of being thought a coward displays little more fortitude." And when the debate drew near to its close, with his heart torn by the recollections of Canning, which had been so often invoked against him, he said, "The credit belongs to others, and not to me. It belongs to Mr. Fox, to Mr. Grattan, to Mr. Plunket, to the gentlemen opposite, and to an illustrious friend of mine, who is now no more. * * * I was on terms of the most friendly intimacy with my right honourable friend down even to the day of his death; and I say, with as much sincerity of heart as man can speak, that I wish he were now alive to reap the harvest which he sowed, and to enjoy the triumph which his exertions gained. I would say of him as he said of the late Mr. Perceval: 'Would he were here to enjoy the fruit of his victory!'—

'Tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur, Achille.'"

—*Guizot's "Memoirs of Peel."*

Peel's Denunciation of Cobbett.—In 1833, Cobbett proposed a lengthy motion, the effect of which was to pray the King to dismiss Sir Robert Peel from his Privy Council, as the author of the Bill of 1819, which had been the cause of the distress of the country. A long, and, though occasionally violent, a feeble speech from Cobbett ushered in the motion, which was seconded by Mr. John Feilden. Sir Robert answered him in a magnificent speech, of which the most remarkable passage, though it has often been quoted, will bear repetition here. After an elaborate refutation of all Cobbett's arguments, and a scornful repudiation of the implied accusation that he had himself gained by the change of currency, Sir Robert burst forth in these words:—"It is on public grounds that the honourable member assails me. The honourable member has not the same motives for attacking me which he has had for attacking others. I have

never lent the honourable member my confidence; from me the honourable member has never received any obligation. His object in assailing me is, doubtless, to strike terror by the threat of his denunciations—to discourage opposition, from the fear of being signalised as a victim. But I tell the gentlemen of England that their best security is in boldly facing and defying such insidious efforts. God forbid that the honourable member's speculations on the prospect of public confusion should be realised. I labour under no anxiety that they will. I feel confident that whatever may be the political differences that divide public men, all who are interested in the upholding of law and property will unite in their defence to put down such attempts. Not only would it be the bitterest calamity, but a calamity embittered by the greatest disgrace, to live under such an ignoble tyranny as he would impose.

> 'Come the eleventh plague rather than this should be;
> Come sink us rather in the sea;
> Come, rather, pestilence, and reap us down;
> Come God's sword, rather than our own.
> Let rather Roman come again,
> Or Saxon, Norman, or the Dane.
> In all the bonds we ever bore,
> We grieved, we sighed, we wept;—we never blushed before.'

Blush, indeed, we shall, if we submit to this base and vulgar domination; and I for one—believing as I do that I have been selected as an object of attack, for the purpose of discouraging resistance to the insidious efforts which the honourable gentleman is daily making to weaken the foundations of property and the authority of the law—I will, at least, preserve myself from the reproach of having furthered the objects he has in view by any symptom of intimidation or submission." The passage from old Abraham Cowley, delivered with the fine sonorous voice and lofty manner into which Sir Robert Peel fell in moments of *real* excitement, produced an electrical effect. Well we remember the scene.

Cobbett, his grey hairs pleading for his sincerity, had been heard as a duty, but with regret. His antagonist had borne himself along on the rising sympathy of the House. Rarely, indeed, does the British senate even *seem* to do injustice; but now, the disgust of the listeners, and their excitement under Sir Robert's stirring address, overpowered all forms. Cobbett rose, was met with a shout almost of execration, retired to his seat, rose again, again was met with an indignant repulse, once more and yet once more essayed to speak against the storm of passion, till at last he staggered to his place beside his seconder, for the first time, perhaps, in his life utterly quelled by his fellow-men. The accused statesman, gathering himself up with dignity, declared he would not vote on a question so personal to himself, and left the House majestically, amidst a hurricane of cheers. Four members only—John O'Connell, Thomas Attwood, James Roe, and Patrick Leader, were found supporting Cobbett and Feilden, while the voters for Peel numbered 298. Then came an incident scarcely less dramatic. Lord Althorp, the Whig chief of the House, moved that the resolution should be *expunged from the Journals.* On a division there were still only four against the motion, Feargus O'Connor supplying the place of John O'Connell; and, the votes on the other side amounting to 295, the resolution of Lord Althorp was carried out.—*Francis's "Critical Biography of Peel."*

Peel's Challenge to O'Connell.—In August, 1815, in consequence of some expressions used by the great agitator at a public meeting, a hostile correspondence took place between Mr. Peel (then Irish Secretary) and that gentleman, which, however, ended as it had begun. Mr. O'Connell was arrested, and bound to keep the peace within the kingdom; they then agreed to go to the Continent, but Mr. O'Connell was again placed under arrest on reaching London. Much controversy occurred relative to this affair, but the only plausible or fair conjecture is that some friendly

Argus kept the police on the *qui vive*, to prevent the shedding of valuable blood.—*Mac Ghee's "O'Connell and his Friends."* It was with reference to this affair that Lord Norbury indulged in a jest at O'Connell's expense a short time afterwards. Mr. O'Connell was addressing his lordship, who seemed to pay but indifferent attention to what he was saying. "I am afraid, my lord," said O'Connell, pausing in his argument, "that your lordship does not apprehend me." "I beg your pardon," replied the facetious judge, "I do perfectly; and, indeed, no one is more easily apprehended than Mr. O'Connell, when he wishes to be."

The Fall of Sir Robert Peel.—On the evening of the 25th of June, 1846, the announcement was made to the House of Commons that the Lords had agreed to Sir Robert Peel's Corn and Customs Bills (effecting the Repeal of the Corn Laws) without amendment. This was the signal for the closing of a lengthened debate on the Irish Coercion Bill, then before the House. The circumstances attending the division which hurled Sir Robert Peel from power are thus described by Mr. Disraeli, in his "Life of Lord George Bentinck":—

"At length, about half-past one o'clock, the galleries were cleared, the division called, and the question put. In almost all previous divisions where the fate of a Government had been depending, the vote of every member, with scarcely an exception, had been anticipated; that was not the case in the present instance, and the direction which members took as they left their seats was anxiously watched. More than one hundred Protectionist members followed the Minister; more than eighty avoided the division, a few of these, however, had paired; nearly the same number followed Lord George Bentinck. But it was not merely their numbers that attracted the anxious observation of the Treasury bench, as the Protectionists passed in defile before the Minister to the hostile lobby. It was impossible

that he could have marked them without emotion; the flower of that great party which had been so proud to follow one who had been so proud to lead them. They were men to gain whose hearts and the hearts of their fathers had been the aim and exultation of his life. They had extended to him an unlimited confidence and an admiration without stint. They had stood by him in the darkest hour, and had borne him from the depths of political despair to the proudest of living positions. Right or wrong, they were men of honour, breeding, and refinement, high and generous character, great weight and station in the country, which they had ever placed at his disposal. They had been not only his followers but his friends; had joined in the same pastimes, drank from the same cup, and in the pleasantness of private life had often forgotten together the cares and strife of politics.

"He must have felt something of this, while the Manners, the Somersets, the Bentincks, the Lowthers, and the Lennoxes passed before him. And those country gentlemen, 'those gentlemen of England,' of whom, but five years ago, the very same building was ringing with his pride of being their leader—if his heart were hardened to Sir Charles Burrell, Sir William Jolliffe, Sir Charles Knightly, Sir John Trollope, Sir Edward Kerrison, Sir John Tyrrell, he surely must have had a pang when his eye rested on Sir John Yarde Buller, his choice and pattern country gentleman, whom he had himself selected and invited, but six years back, to move a vote of want of confidence in the Whig Government, in order, against the feeling of the Court, to install Sir Robert Peel in their stead. They trooped on: all the men of mettle and large-acred squires, whose spirit he had so often quickened, and whose counsel he had so often solicited in his fine Conservative speeches in Whitehall Gardens. * * *

"When Prince Metternich was informed, at Dresden,

with great ostentation, that the Emperor had arrived—'Yes; but without his army,' was the reply. Sir Robert Peel was still First Minister of England, as Napoleon remained Emperor for a while after Moscow. Each, perhaps, for a moment had indulged in hope, it is so difficult for those who are on the pinnacle of life to realise disaster. They sometimes contemplate it in their deep and far-seeing calculations, but it is only to imagine a contingency which their resources must surely baffle; they sometimes talk of it to their friends, and oftener of it to their enemies, but it is only as an insurance of their prosperity and as an offering to propitiate their Nemesis. They never believe in it.

"The news that the Government were not only beaten, but by a majority so large as 73, began to circulate. An incredulous murmur passed it along the Treasury bench. 'They say we are beaten by 73!' whispered the most important member of the Cabinet, in a tone of surprise, to Sir Robert Peel. Sir Robert did not reply, or even turn his head. He looked very grave, and extended his chin, as was his habit when he was annoyed and cared not to speak. He began to comprehend his position, and that the Emperor was without his army."

His Character by Guizot.—Sir Robert Peel is the most eminent statesman who has sprung from the ranks of democracy—the most honest as well as the most able, the most congenial and faithful to democracy, at the same time as the most free from its evil tendencies. Although adopted by the aristocracy from his very entrance into public life, and although he served in their ranks, he never gave himself over to them; and far from pretending, as it is said, to the honour of belonging to their body, he was proud of his plebeian origin, and did not seek to conceal it either by his manners or by his maxims. He was dignified without elegance, and with, perhaps, more susceptibility than was consistent with his superiority, which he ought to have enjoyed

with greater confidence and ease. On seeing him at court, in the drawing-rooms of Windsor, I was struck by a little constraint and stiffness in his attitude; he was evidently the most important and the most respected man there, and yet he did not look as if he were at home; his sway did not appear to be exempt from embarrassment; he governed without reigning. No one felt or expressed a deeper and more affectionate respect for the ancient institutions, the ancient manners, the whole old social order of his country; he revered and loved the past though he was not of it—and that is a certain mark of great judgment as well as of virtue; but, at the same time, he regarded aristocratic distinctions and honours with something more than indifference—it was his fixed resolve to reject them.—*Guizot's "Memoirs of Peel."*

HENRY PELHAM.

His Intrepidity.—In the debates on the Excise Bill, in March, 1733, Pelham warmly supported that measure, in defiance of party and popular clamour. During this period of agitation he not only defended the Minister (Walpole) in Parliament, but on one occasion evinced his personal attachment by an act of great intrepidity. After the last debate on the bill, as Sir Robert Walpole was passing through the lobby of the House of Commons, accompanied by Mr. Pelham, he was surrounded by a clamorous mob, not of rabble, but of well-dressed persons. When the two friends had nearly reached the steps leading to Alice's coffee-house, some individuals seized Sir Robert's cloak, and, as the collar was tightly fastened, nearly strangled him. At this moment of danger Mr. Pelham attacked the assailants, pushed Sir Robert into the passage leading to the coffee-house, and, drawing his sword, stationed himself at the entrance, exclaiming in a firm and determined tone, "Now, gentlemen, who will be the first to fall?" This spirited

defiance overawed the assailants, who quietly dispersed.—*Coxe's "Pelham Administration."* The archdeacon adds in a foot-note that the above is a correct version of the occurrence, which was inaccurately given in his "Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole."

A Posthumous Malediction.—The principal article of the Ways and Means (1752) was the land-tax, which the Minister (Mr. Pelham) entertained hopes of reducing to the ordinary rate of two shillings in the pound. He discovered, however, that this reduction could not be effected without trenching on the sinking fund, and thus depreciating the public securities, and therefore he determined to continue the tax at three shillings. This resolution was resisted by some violent members, whom Lord Orford sarcastically terms "the sad refuse of all the last Opposition," who contended that the land was already too much burdened to admit of the continuance of a tax at three shillings. Mr. Pelham and his adherents, in reply, alluded to the great rise in the value of land, which, they said, rendered reduction unnecessary. The arguments and influence of the Minister prevailed, and the resolution was carried in the committee by 176 against 50. On the report the opposition was still more feeble; and Mr. Sydenham concluded a speech which closed the discussion, by a ludicrous parody of the well-known epitaph on Sir John Vanbrugh, which he applied to Mr. Pelham—

"Lie heavy on him, *land*, for he
Laid many a heavy load on thee."

The resolution was finally adopted by a majority of 58 against 19.—*Ibid.*

SPENCER PERCEVAL.

A Chancellor's Difficulty.—The illness of George III. in 1811, which incapacitated him for affixing his sign-

manual to bills, gave rise to a singular discussion in the House of Commons. The matter is thus referred to in the "Malmesbury Correspondence":—"Mr. Ross to the Earl of Malmesbury. Spring Gardens, January 4th, 1811. The business that is to come on in the House of Commons to-night offers none of the least curious circumstances of the present eventful times. That two deputy clerks, whose salaries are not more than £150 per annum each, should have had the power of stopping the issue of £1,500,000 of the public money, seems extraordinary, but so it is. Mr. Perceval (Chancellor of the Exchequer) used every means to persuade them to put the Privy Seal to the warrant, and amongst other reasons endeavoured to prove to them that, as the King only *signed* but did not *write* the bill (for so I understand it is called), they might venture to do it without the sign-manual. Their oath is not to put the Privy Seal to any bill which has not the sign-manual." The sum in question was required for the service of the army and navy, and to meet the emergency the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved a resolution which was agreed to by the House, commanding the auditor and officers of the Exchequer to pay such sums as the exigency required upon the warrants of any three or more of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury. This resolution of the Commons was also agreed to by the House of Lords.

His Assassination.—A motion was carried at the end of April, 1812, for examining the question (the effect produced on the trade of the country by the Orders in Council) in a committee of the whole House, and in taking the evidence which was adduced to show the ruinous effects of the system, Mr. Perceval with Mr. Stephen bore night after night the principal part. As they both hoped that the clamour out of doors would subside, if time were given, the struggle always was to put off the inquiry, and thus to protract the decision; and Messrs. Brougham and Baring, who

conducted it with some difficulty, prevailed so far as to begin the examination of the witnesses exactly at half-past four o'clock. On the 11th of May, Mr. Perceval had been later than the appointed time, and after complaining of this delay, Mr. Brougham, at a quarter before five, had called his first witness, and was examining him, when a messenger deputed to bring the Minister met him walking towards the House with Mr. Stephen arm-in-arm. He instantly, with his accustomed activity, darted forward to obey the summons, but for which Mr. Stephen, who happened to be on his left side, would have been the victim of the assassin's blow, which prostrated Mr. Perceval as he entered the lobby. The wretched man, by name Bellingham, had no kind of quarrel with him, but complained of a suit at St. Petersburg having been neglected by our ambassador there, Lord Granville, whom he intended to have destroyed had not Mr. Perceval fallen first in his way. He never attempted to escape; but was taken, committed, tried, condemned, executed, dissected, all within one week from the time that he fired the shot.—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

WILLIAM PITT.

A Child's Ambition.—In August, 1766, when the world was agitated by the news that Mr. Pitt had become Earl of Chatham, little William exclaimed, "I am glad that I am not the eldest son. I want to speak in the House of Commons, like papa."—*Macaulay's "Biography of Pitt."*

Precocious Criticism.—When he was at home he had frequent opportunities of hearing important debates at Westminster; and he heard them, not only with interest and enjoyment, but with a close scientific attention resembling that with which a diligent pupil at Guy's Hospital watches every turn of the hand of a great surgeon through a difficult operation. On one of these occasions, Pitt, a youth whose

abilities were as yet known only to his family and to a small knot of college friends, was introduced on the steps of the throne in the House of Lords to Fox, who was his senior by eleven years, and who was already the greatest debater, and one of the greatest orators that had appeared in England. Fox used afterwards to relate that, as the discussion proceeded, Pitt repeatedly turned to him and said, "But surely, Mr. Fox, that might be met thus;" or "Yes; but he lays himself open to this retort." What the particular criticisms were, Fox had forgotten; but he said he was much struck at the time by the precocity of a lad who, through the whole sitting, seemed to be thinking only how all the speeches on both sides could be answered.—*Ibid.*

"Never was a Boy."—The following entry occurs in the Journal of Francis Horner, 1805:—"On one occasion, with Ward and John Ponsonby, when there was a great deal of conversation about the exercises and sports of the common people, the impolicy of suppressing them, &c., and when we ran over the names of the different public men, in the state and the law, whose opinions upon such a point of policy might come to be of importance, I hazarded Pitt's name. 'Oh!' exclaimed Windham, 'Pitt never was a boy; besides, such questions won't conduce to make a minister.'"

Rising Men.—When he first entered Parliament Pitt lived much in what may be termed a select club of his personal friends, young men of great talent, most of whom looked up to him as their political leader. They were about twenty-five in number, and met at the house of a man named Goosetree, in Pall Mall. Among them were Pratt (afterwards Lord Camden), Althorp (afterwards Lord Spencer), Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville), Robinson (afterwards Lord Rokeby), Smith (afterwards Lord Carrington), Lords Duncannon, Euston, &c.—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

Pitt's First Speech.—On the 26th of February (1781), Mr. Burke's renewed Bill for the Reduction of the Civil List was rejected by 233 to 190. On this occasion Mr. Sheridan and Mr. John Townshend made their first speeches. But, above all, Mr. William Pitt spoke with a fluency, a precision, a dignity, and a method which are usually the acquirements of many years of practice. Lord North declared it was the best *first* speech he had ever heard. The effect appears to have been prodigious. By no one was Mr. Pitt's success more warmly greeted than by Mr. Fox. Lord Holland has related an anecdote which illustrates the presence of mind of the young orator. "As Mr. Fox hurried up to Mr. Pitt to compliment him on his speech, an old member, said to be General Grant, passed by and said, 'Ay, Mr. Fox, you are praising young Pitt for his speech. You may well do so; for, excepting yourself, there's no man in the House can make such another; and, old as I am, I expect and hope to hear you both battling it within these walls as I have done your fathers before.' Mr. Fox, disconcerted at the awkward turn of the compliment, was silent, and looked foolish; but young Pitt, with great delicacy, readiness, and felicity of expression, answered, 'I have no doubt, general, you would like to attain the age of Methuselah.'" Before long Mr. Fox had an opportunity of testifying in public the admiration he had avowed in private; and early in the following year, in praising a speech of Mr. Pitt, he said "he could no longer lament the loss of Lord Chatham, for he was again living in his son, with all his virtues and all his talents."—*Russell's "Life of Fox."* Macaulay relates in his biography, "Pitt made his first speech in favour of Burke's plan of economical reform. Fox stood up at the same moment, but instantly gave way. The lofty yet animated deportment of the young member, his perfect self-possession, the readiness with which he replied to the orators who had preceded him, the silver tones

of his voice, the perfect structure of his unpremeditated sentences, astonished and delighted his hearers. Burke, moved even to tears, exclaimed, 'It is not a chip of the old block; it is the old block itself.' 'Pitt will be one of the first men in Parliament,' said a member of the Opposition to Fox. 'He is so already,' answered Fox, in whose nature envy had no place. It is a curious fact, well remembered by some who were very recently living, that soon after this debate, Pitt's name was put up by Fox at Brookes's."

Agamemnon and Achilles.—A debate on the Army Estimates took place in the House of Commons, December, 1781. Lord George Germaine had taken occasion two days before to declare that, be the consequences what they might, he would never consent to sign the independence of the colonies. Lord North, on the contrary, had shown strong symptoms of yielding. Pitt was inveighing with much force against these discordant counsels at so perilous a juncture, when the two ministers whom he arraigned drew close and began to whisper, while Mr. Welbore Ellis, a grey-haired placeman, of diminutive size, the butt of "Junius" under the by-name of Grildrig, bent down his tiny head between them. Here Pitt paused in his argument, and glancing at the group, exclaimed, "I will wait until the unanimity is a little better restored. I will wait until the Nestor of the Treasury has reconciled the difference between the Agamemnon and the Achilles of the American war."—*Stanhope's "Life of Pitt."*

Speaking under Difficulties.—Wilberforce said, when Pitt undertook, on February 21st, 1783, the difficult task of defending the recent peace, I well remember that he was so oppressed by a severe sick-headache as to be scarcely able to hold up his head. Fox assailed him in a very able speech, in the midst of which Pitt was obliged, from actual sickness, to retire to the entry door called Solomon's Porch,

behind the Speaker's chair. I seem to see him holding the door in one hand, while he yielded to his malady, and turning his ear towards the House, that, if possible, he might not lose a single sentence that Fox uttered. Never do I recollect to have witnessed such a triumph of mind over physical depression. When Fox sat down he replied to him with great ability, though with less brilliancy than usual; but on a renewal of the same discussion, a few days after, in a different form, he made one of the finest speeches ever delivered in Parliament.—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

Forbidding the Banns.—The finest, in all probability, of his speeches is that upon the peace of 1783 and the Coalition, when he closed his magnificent peroration by that noble yet simple figure, "And if this inauspicious union be not already consummated, in the name of my country I forbid the banns."—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

His most Effective Speech.—On the 18th of May, 1803, war was declared, and on the 23rd and 24th occurred one of the most memorable debates which ever took place in the House of Commons. On the first night Pitt spoke, and on the second, Fox, and both exerted their highest powers. Of Pitt's speech Lord Malmesbury says: "Pitt's speech last night was the finest he ever made. Never was any speech so cheered, or so incessantly and loudly applauded." But the best account we have of this speech is from a letter of Lord Dudley, then Mr. Ward, to the Rev. E. Copleston (afterwards Bishop of Llandaff): "Whatever may have been its comparative merits, its effects were astonishing, and, I believe, unequalled. When he came in, which he did not till after Lord Hawkesbury had been speaking nearly an hour, all the attention of the House was withdrawn for some moments from the orator and fixed on him; and as he walked up to his place, his name was repeated aloud by many persons, for want, I imagine, of

some other way to express their feelings. Erskine and Whitbread were heard with impatience, and when, at the end of a tedious hour and a half, he rose (twenty minutes to eight), there was first a violent and almost universal cry of 'Mr. Pitt! Mr. Pitt!' He was then cheered before he had uttered a syllable—a mark of approbation which was repeated at almost all the brilliant passages and remarkable sentiments; and when he sat down (nine), there followed one of the longest, most eager, and most enthusiastic bursts of applause I ever heard in any place on any occasion. As far as I observed, however, it was confined to the parliamentary 'Hear him! Hear him!' but it is possible the exclamations in the body of the House might have hindered me from hearing the clapping of hands in the gallery. This wonderful agitation, you will readily perceive, it would not be fair to ascribe wholly to the superiority of his eloquence on that particular occasion. He was applauded before he spoke,* which is alone a sufficient proof. Much must be attributed to his return at such an awful moment to an assembly which he had been accustomed to rule, from which he had been long absent, and in which he had not left a successor; some little, perhaps, to his addressing a new Parliament, in which there were many members by whom he had never or rarely been heard, and whose curiosity must of course have been raised to the highest pitch."—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

An "Inspired" Orator.—On the breaking up of the House, after the memorable debate (on the slave trade) in which Pitt spoke so finely, Windham, who was by no means partial to Pitt, and who did not take the abolition side, met Wilberforce and accosted him thus: "Really, if your friend Pitt should speak often as he did last night, he will make

* This was evidently most unusual in Pitt's time, although it has since become a common practice. The extract also shows that "Hear him!" was then the parliamentary sign of approbation.

converts of us all. It was as if he were inspired."—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

Exceptions.—On his Additional Force Bill, in 1805, Pitt had a meeting of country gentlemen to consider the measure. One of them objected to a clause for calling out the force, which he insisted should not be done "except in case of actual invasion." Pitt replied, "That would be too late;" but the gentleman still insisted on the case of "actual invasion." By-and-by they came to another clause to render the force more disposable; the same gentleman objected again, and insisted very warmly that he never would consent to its being sent out of England. "Except, I suppose," rejoined Pitt, "in case of actual invasion."—*Quarterly Review.*

Eve.—Pitt one night, alluding to his small number of adherents on the Declaratory Bill, said that he appeared in the House of Commons as Eve in the garden of God, single and naked, yet not ashamed!—*Lord Orford's Memoirs.*

His Classical Studies.—Pitt (said Lord Grenville) "ascribed his fluency to the following circumstances:—At Hayes (his father's seat), where they lived in great seclusion, it was his custom in the morning to construe his author, Virgil or Livy, to his tutor, Mr. Wilson; and in the evening, after tea, to translate the same passage freely, with the book open before him, to his father and the rest of the family. He often mentioned this to me as the way he thought he acquired his fluency in public speaking; and it is remarkable that in conversation, when an ancient writer was quoted, he always turned the passage into English (for his own use, as it seemed) before he appeared completely to enter into it—a habit I ascribe to this practice." Redhead Yorke mentions his being present when somebody quoted the following passage from the "De Claris Oratoribus" of Cicero to Mr. Pitt:—"Est cum eloquentia sicut flammâ:

materie alitur, motû excitatur, et urendo clarescit." It was observed that it was untranslatable, on which Mr. Pitt immediately replied, "No, I should translate it thus: 'It is with eloquence as with a flame. It requires fuel to feed it, motion to excite it, and it brightens as it burns.'"—*Samuel Rogers' "Recollections."*

His Style.—Mr. Pitt's style was, by Mr. Windham, called "a State-paper style," in allusion to its combined dignity and poverty; and the same nice observer, referring to the eminently skilful way in which he balanced his phrases, sailed near the wind, and seemed to disclose much whilst he kept the greater part of his meaning to himself, declared that "he verily believed Mr. Pitt could speak a king's speech off-hand."—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

Finished Oratory.—Of Mr. Pitt, Wilberforce said that he came into Parliament so accomplished an orator that in the arrangement of his matter, the force of his reasoning, and in all the graces of finished elocution, his first speeches were almost equal to his last. Mr. Windham's speeches, he said, were known to have been prepared with assiduous care; and, though interspersed with anecdotes which seemed spontaneous, to have been written down before delivery. Sheridan's were so diligently elaborated that he had been known often, before the occurrence of a great debate, to shut himself in his room, day after day, where he was heard declaiming for hours.—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

A Reconciliation Prevented.—Lord Brougham relates the following as a "singular instance of the great effects of trivial circumstances." During the co-operation of all parties against Mr. Addington's Government, in the spring of 1804, Mr. Pitt and Mr. C. Long were one night passing the door of Brookes's club-house, on their way from the House of Commons, when Mr. Pitt, who had not been there since the Coalition of 1784, said he had a great mind

to go in and sup. His wary friend said, "I think you had better not," and turned aside the well-conceived intention. When we reflect, says Brougham, on the high favour Mr. Pitt was then in with the Whigs, and consider the nature of Mr. Fox as well as his own, we can have little doubt of the cordial friendship which such a night would have cemented, and that the union of the two parties would have been complete.—*Historical Sketches.*

LORD PLUNKET.

"Take Down his Words."—A remarkable effect is said to have been produced by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket, in the Irish House of Commons, upon some one calling out to take down his words. "Stop," said this consummate orator, "and you shall have something more to take down;" and then followed in a torrent the most vehement and indignant description of the wrongs which his country had sustained, and had still to endure.—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

The Felon Transformed.—Lord Plunket explaining why he had now become a Reformer when he had before opposed the question, "Circumstances," said he, "are wholly changed; formerly Reform came to our door like a felon—a robber to be resisted. He now approaches like a creditor; you admit the justice of his demand, and only dispute the time and instalments by which he shall be paid." —*Ibid.*

Professional Acumen.—Lord Brougham records the following circumstance in the preface which he wrote for the "Life of Lord Plunket":—"There was on one occasion a very remarkable instance of his readiness at taking up a subject under extraordinary difficulties, and of this my personal recollection is very distinct, for I had in the debate experience of his power. On the case of Windham Quin,

brought before the House of Commons by the friends of Chief Baron O'Grady, we examined witnesses for above a week, and Sir Robert Peel sat by us supporting his friend Quin, heard all the evidence, and, indeed, took a part in the examination of the witnesses. The evidence was, of course, printed, and Plunket's only knowledge of our proceedings was from reading it on his journey to London. Peel made an elaborate and able defence of his friend, and Plunket took the same side; but there was this remarkable difference between the two speeches; Peel, familiar with the case in all its particulars, spoke in mitigation of censure, admitting the charge to have been proved. He had gone over the ground without perceiving that there was enough to support a plea of not guilty. Plunket at once took that course; he had found the materials for it in the printed evidence, though absent during the whole proceedings; and, having had to answer his wonderful speech, I can truly say that no one could have supposed he had not been present. This incident was often referred to as showing the difference between an ordinary person, however able, but unprofessional, and one with the experience and habits of an advocate. The admirable defence by Plunket was justly ascribed to his professional skill, and no one questioned the ability of Peel or his heartiness in supporting his friend."

Retrospection.—Mr. Plunket made perhaps his most brilliant speech on the motion for a committee on the Roman Catholic claims, introduced February 28th, 1821. In adducing names of authority in support of his arguments, he said: "Backed by the memories of the great lights and ornaments of the late reign—of Dunning, Pitt, Fox, Burke, Sheridan, and Windham—backed, I say, by the name of every man who possessed buoyancy enough to float down the stream of time—I feel that I have made out, I had almost said that I had established, the position that I sought, triumphantly. But when I look around me, and

reflect on those whom I miss, and who were present when I last had the honour of addressing the House on this question, I am checked. When I reflect that since that period we have lost Whitbread, the incorruptible sentinel of the constitution—that we have lost the aid of the more than dawning virtues of Horner—that we had then Romilly, whose mature excellencies shed a steady light on his profession, on his country, and his nature—that Elliott, the pure model of aristocracy—that the illustrious Ponsonby, the constitutional leader of the ranks of Opposition in this House, revering alike the privileges of the Crown and the rights of the subject—are no more; but, above all, when I dwell on that last overwhelming loss—the loss of that great man (Henry Grattan) in whose place I this night unworthily stand, and with the description of whose exalted merits I would not trust myself—God knows, I cannot feel anything like triumph! Walking before the sacred images of these illustrious dead, as in a public and solemn procession, shall we not dismiss all party feeling, all angry passions, and unworthy prejudices?"—*Hansard.*

WILLIAM PULTENEY.

A Horatian Bet.—On February 11th, 1741, Sandys informed Walpole in the House of Commons that he should, on the following Friday, bring an accusation of several articles against him. The minister, who received the intimation with great dignity and composure, immediately rose, thanked him for his notice, and, after requesting a candid and impartial hearing, declared that he would not fail to attend the House, as he was not conscious of any crime to deserve accusation. He laid his hand on his breast, and said, with some emotion—

"Nil conscire sibi, nulli pallescere culpæ."

Pulteney observed that the right honourable gentleman's

logic and Latin were equally inaccurate, and declared he had misquoted Horace, who had written *nullâ pallescere culpâ.* The minister defended his quotation, and, Pulteney repeating his assertion, he offered a wager of a guinea. Pulteney accepted the challenge, and referred the decision of the dispute to the minister's friend, Nicholas Hardinge, clerk of the House, a man distinguished for classical erudition. Hardinge decided against Walpole; the guinea was immediately thrown to Pulteney, who caught it, and holding it up to the House exclaimed, "It is the only money I have received from the Treasury for many years, and it shall be the last."—*Coxe's "Life of Walpole."* The identical guinea may now be seen in the Medal Room of the British Museum, with the following memorandum in the handwriting of Pulteney:—"This guinea I desire may be kept as an heir-loom. It was won of Sir Robert Walpole in the House of Commons, he asserting the verse in Horace to be *nulli pallescere culpæ*, whereas I laid the wager of a guinea that it was *nullâ pallescere culpâ.* He sent for the book, and, being convinced that he had lost, gave me this guinea. I told him I could take the money without any blush on my side, but believed it was the only money he ever gave in the House, where the giver and receiver ought not equally to blush. This guinea, I hope, will prove to my posterity the use of knowing Latin, and encourage them in their learning."

Disparaging the Peers.—"When I have turned out Sir Robert Walpole," remarked Pulteney on one occasion, "I will retire into that hospital for invalids, the House of Peers." He afterwards entered the "hospital" as Earl of Bath.

JOHN PYM.

A Sophistical Defence.—The following anecdote of Pym is related in Lord North's "Narrative":—"The House

had newly received a message from his Majesty (Charles I.), which was so far from being satisfactory as many persons spoke against it with much vehemence, and among the rest Sir Henry Ludlow, who very resolutely used these terms, 'He who sent this message is not fit to be King of England.' Upon saying this, he was immediately interrupted, and the words that were spoken agreed upon preparatory to a charge; but before his withdrawing in order to a censure, Mr. Pym arose and said, 'That those words contained nothing of dishonour to the King;' which being found very strange he thus cleared his meaning: 'If these words be such as a fair conclusion is naturally deducible from them, then they cannot be evil in themselves. Now, that a fair conclusion naturally ariseth from them may be proved by syllogism. He who sent this message is not worthy to be King of England; but King Charles is worthy to be King of England; therefore, King Charles sent not this message. Now,' saith Mr. Pym, 'I leave it to judgment whether or no this syllogism comprise anything in it worthy of censure.' This argument was so ingenious as Sir Henry Ludlow (with his ill meaning) came freely off without punishment."

ATTEMPT TO COMMUNICATE THE PLAGUE TO PYM.—Pym was sitting in his usual place on the right hand, beyond the members' gallery, near the bar, on the 25th of October, 1641, when, in the midst of debate on a proposition he had submitted for allowance of "powder and bullet" to the City Guard, a letter was brought to him. The sergeant of the House had received it from a messenger at the door, to whom a gentleman on horseback in a grey coat had given it that morning, on Fish Street Hill—with a gift of a shilling, and injunction to deliver it with great care and speed. As Pym opened the letter, something dropped out of it on the floor; but without giving heed to this he read to himself a few words, and then, holding up the paper, called it a scandalous libel. Hereupon it was carried up to the lately-

appointed clerk's assistant, Mr. John Rushworth, who, in his unmoved way, read aloud its abuse of the great leader of the House, and its asseveration that if he should escape the present attempt, the writer had a dagger prepared for him. At this point, however, young Mr. Rushworth would seem to have lost his coolness, for he read the next few lines in an agitated way. They explained what had dropped from the letter. It was a rag that had come from a plague wound, sent in the hope that infection might by such means be borne to him who opened it. Whereupon the said clerk's assistant, having read so far, threw down the letter into the house, and so it was spurned away out of the door—*Forster's "The Grand Remonstrance."*

MR. ROEBUCK.

"Tear 'em."—In a speech delivered at the Cutlers' Feast, Sheffield, September 2nd, 1858, Mr. Roebuck referred to the visit he had just paid to Cherbourg with other members of the House of Commons. After expressing, in strong language, his opinion of the character of the French ruler, he proceeded:—"It may be said that those who stand in my position ought not to say anything that excites national animosity; and I respond to that sentiment. But, sir, the farmer who goes to sleep, having placed the watch-dog 'Tear 'em' over his rick-yard, hears that watch-dog bark. He, in the anger of a half somnolence, says, 'I wish Tear 'em would be quiet;' and bawls out of the window, 'Down, Tear 'em.' 'Tear 'em' does go down; the farmer goes to sleep, and he is awoke by the flashing in at his windows of the light of his ricks on fire. I am 'Tear 'em.' I tell you to beware. What is the meaning of Cherbourg? It is a standing menace to England."—"*Times*" *Report.*

An Unaccustomed Character.—Mr. Roebuck, in one of the debates in 1855 on the condition of the Crimean army and the conduct of Ministers, spoke of the Duke of New-

castle as "a scapegoat that had been sent into the wilderness with the sins of the Administration on his head." He was replied to by some of the duke's colleagues with great severity; whereupon he said, "Sir, I take shame to myself for once in my life. I have indulged in panegyric, but, like almost all other men who attempt a character to which they are not accustomed, I have failed in representing it, and have failed also most completely in making myself understood. I did object to making the Duke of Newcastle a scapegoat. I gave that noble duke credit for industry and good intentions, and I said that he had done his duty according to his ability. Then I am turned round upon because I am said to have eulogised the noble duke."—*Hansard.*

Reading from a Newspaper.—Mr. Roebuck was making a speech on the resignation of Lord John Russell after his return from Vienna in 1855, when an incident occurred which is thus referred to in "Hansard":—"The hon. and learned gentlemen was beginning to read a passage in Lord John Russell's speech from a newspaper, when he was interrupted by calls to 'order;' whereupon he tore a piece out of the newspaper and was proceeding with his quotation, when Mr. Speaker said the rules of the House did not allow the hon. and learned member to quote from a newspaper a speech which had been delivered during the session, and he did not think the hon. and learned member could cure the irregularity by tearing a piece out. Mr. Roebuck: 'Then I will give the effect of the noble lord's statement from my own memory; and if I am incorrect, the fault is not with me, but with the rule of the House which obliges me to rely upon that faulty instrument when I have a correct report at hand.'"

EARL RUSSELL.

A Host in Himself.—Walking some years ago (about 1838 or 1839) through the Park with the Duke of Wellington,

I said to him, among other things, "What an array there is in the House of Commons against Lord John Russell—Peel, Stanley, Graham, &c.!" "Lord John," replied the Duke, "is a host in himself."—*S. Rogers' "Recollections."*

His Introduction of the Reform Bill.—Earl Russell gives, in the introduction to his "Speeches," the following account of the effect produced in Parliament by the provisions of the first Reform Bill:—"So little were the opposite party prepared for the Bill, that a few days before the 1st of March, Sir Robert Peel, in a careful speech, derided what had been done on the subjects of peace and retrenchment, and predicted that when the plan of Reform should be developed, it would occasion disappointment by the meagreness of its proportions and the trifling nature of the changes recommended. The effect, therefore, of the revelations of the 1st of March was astounding. * * * It was no wonder that this proposition, when placed boldly and baldly before the House of Commons, created feelings of astonishment, mingled with joy or with consternation, according to the temper of the hearers. Mr. John Smith, himself a member for a nomination borough, said the proposal took away his breath. Some, perhaps many, thought that the measure was a prelude to civil war, which, in point of fact, it averted. But incredulity was the prevailing feeling, both among the moderate Whigs and the great mass of the Tories. The Radicals alone were delighted and triumphant. Mr. Joseph Hume, when I met him in the streets a day or two afterwards, assured me of his hearty support to the Government. He said on another subject, in a public speech, that he was ready to vote black white in order to carry the measure of Reform. Lord Durham, who was sitting under the gallery on the 1st of March, told me he was inclined to doubt the reality of what was passing before his eyes. A noble lord who sat opposite to me, and who has long ago succeeded to a seat in the House

of Lords, cheered me so vociferously that I was myself inclined to doubt his meaning. I found afterwards that his cheers were meant derisively, to show his thorough conviction of the absurdity and impracticability of my proposals." Lord Broughton, in his "Recollections" says: "Never shall I forget the astonishment of my neighbours as Lord John Russell developed his plan. Indeed, all the House seemed perfectly astounded; and when he read the long list of the boroughs to be either wholly or partially disfranchised, there was a sort of wild ironical laughter. Lord John seemed rather to play with the fears of his audience; and, after detailing some clauses that seemed to complete the scheme, smiled and paused, and said, 'More yet.' When Lord John sat down, we of the Mountain cheered long and loud, although there was hardly one of us that believed such a scheme could, by any possibility, become the law of the land."

Upsetting the Coach.—The satirist's portrait of Lord John Russell, in the following lines, becomes far from uncomplimentary at its close:—

"Next cool, and all unconscious of reproach,
Comes the calm 'Johnny who upset the coach.'*
How formed to lead, if not too proud to please—
His fame would fire you, but his manners freeze.
Like or dislike, he does not care a jot;
He wants your vote, but your affection not.
Yet human hearts need sun, as well as oats,—
So cold a climate plays the deuce with votes.

* A note is added here: "Lord Stanley's memorable exclamation on a certain occasion, which now belongs to history—'Johnny's upset the coach.' Never was coach upset with such perfect *sang-froid* on the part of the driver." The coach in question was the Ministry of Earl Grey, in 1834. The exclamation was hastily scribbled on a piece of paper, and passed to Sir James Graham. The story went that Sir James slipped this paper into his pocket; it was found there the same night by his valet, who carried it to the *Times* office, and in this way the ministerial crisis oozed out to the public. This story, however, has been denied.

And while his doctrines ripen day by day,
His frost-nipp'd party pines itself away;—
From the starved wretch its own loved child we steal,
And 'Free Trade' chirrups on the lap of Peel!
But see our statesman when the steam is on,
And languid Johnny glows to glorious John!
When Hampden's thought, by Falkland's muses drest,
Lights the pale cheek and swells the generous breast;
When the pent heat expands the quickening soul,
And foremost in the race the wheels of genius roll!"

—*Bulwer's "The New Timon."*

An Honourable Career.—When the Reform Bill of the Aberdeen Ministry, of which Lord John Russell had charge in the House of Commons, was withdrawn in 1854, his lordship received one of the highest compliments ever offered by a political opponent. Mr. Disraeli said: "Although it has been my fate to be always seated opposite to the noble lord, I can say, most sincerely, that no one in this House has a more heartfelt respect for the noble lord than I have. I think his character and career are precious possessions of the House of Commons, and I am sure that the members of this House will always cherish them. Wherever the noble lord sits, I am sure he will be accompanied by the respect of every member of this House; and I think the manner in which to-night he has made what was evidently a painful communication is in every way worthy of the noble lord's character."

"Rest and be Thankful."—Earl Russell was entertained to dinner at Blairgowrie on the 26th of September, 1863, when, replying to the toast "Her Majesty's Ministers," he said: "With regard to domestic policy, I think we are all pretty much agreed, because the feeling of the country, and of those who have conducted great reforms, is very much like that of the man who, having made a road in your own highlands, put a stone on the top of the mountain with an inscription, 'Rest and be thankful.' That seems to be very much like our feeling; not that there are not other

roads to make and other mountains to climb. But it seems to be the feeling of the country, in which I cannot help joining, that our policy is rather to 'rest and be thankful' than to make new roads."—*Times.*

Earl Russell's Judgment on Himself.—To speak of my own work, I can only rejoice that I have been allowed to have my share in the task accomplished in the half-century which has elapsed from 1819 to 1869. My capacity, I always felt, was very inferior to that of the men who have attained in past times the foremost place in our Parliament, and in the councils of our Sovereign. I have committed many errors, some of them very gross blunders. But the generous people of England are always forbearing and forgiving to those statesmen who have the good of their country at heart. Like my betters, I have been misrepresented and slandered by those who know nothing of me: but I have been more than compensated by the confidence and the friendship of the best men of my own political connection, and by the regard and favourable interpretation of my motives which I have heard expressed by my generous opponents, from the days of Lord Castlereagh to those of Mr. Disraeli.—*Introduction to "Speeches."*

Talent in the Lords.—When a great question arises (says Earl Russell) which requires a display of more than ordinary knowledge of history, more accurate learning, more constitutional lore, and more practical wisdom than is to be found in the usual debates of Parliament, I know not where

> "the general debate,
> The popular harangue, the tart reply,
> The logic and the wisdom and the wit,"

are to be found in greater perfection than among the prelates on the episcopal bench, the peers of three centuries of nobility, and the recent occupants of the woolsack.—*Ibid.*

SIR WILLIAM SCOTT (LORD STOWELL).

Mere Novelties.—Of every change he was the enemy. As he could imagine nothing better than the existing state of any given thing, he could see only peril and hazard in the search for anything new; and with him it was quite enough to characterise a measure as "a mere novelty," to deter him at once from entertaining it—a phrase of which Mr. Speaker Abbott, with some humour, once took advantage to say, when asked by his friend what that mass of papers might be, pointing to the huge bundle of the Acts of a single session, "Mere novelties, Sir William—mere novelties."—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

RICHARD LALOR SHEIL.

The Grave of the Government.—Mr. Sheil was distinguished, like O'Connell, by his advocacy of a Repeal of the Union, and was one of the most eloquent and impressive speakers in the Parliament (1835). On a motion respecting Ireland, during Peel's short administration, he said that the grievances of that country had been fatal to several Governments, and "even now," pointing with bended form to that space of the floor which lies before the Treasury bench, "have dug the grave that is yawning before the present one." The sensation which his action and his figure created was so intense that we were almost tempted to look if there were not a chasm in the place he pointed to. He spoke with prophetic lore.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

Brave Words.—Towards the end of March, 1848, considerable apprehensions were entertained regarding the effect of certain writings and speeches addressed to the working classes—then suffering severely from want of

employment—by Mr. Feargus O'Connor. Meeting him one day in the lobby of the House of Commons, Mr. Sheil drew him aside, and expostulated with him in a friendly but warning tone on the mischief he might heedlessly do to others as well as to himself. Remonstrance appearing to prove ineffectual, he said at length, in low but monitory accents, "Well, you will take your own course; but remember, I tell you as a friend, the Home Office has its eye upon you, and you may regret when too late your unwillingness to take prudent advice." "Oh!" exclaimed O'Connor, raising his voice, "this comes well from the *Right Honourable* Richard Lalor Sheil, whom I once heard on the hustings—when he was only, like myself, a plain *honourable* gentleman—tell the people what their rights were, and that if after due demand they could not get them by peaceful and constitutional means, he would not be found to shrink from leading them when other efforts must be tried." "But did you never hear," said Mr. Sheil, "what the people said to me afterwards? They told me that they knew very well that I had no more notion of taking up arms, or leading them to the field, than Feargus O'Connor."—*Torrens' "Memoirs of Sheil."*

A Charge of Duplicity.—Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill, in 1833, stated at Hull that an Irish member who had denounced the Coercion Bill in the House of Commons had himself recommended the Government to bring it in. It was mentioned in several newspapers that it was to Mr. Sheil that Mr. Hill alluded. Mr. Sheil, feeling that a formal encounter with Mr. Hill would not confute that gentleman, determined the matter should be brought before the House of Commons, and to compel Mr. Hill to prefer and prove his charge. Mr. Hill did make the charge against Mr. Sheil in the House on the 5th February, 1834, and Lord Althorp declared that Mr. Sheil spoke in one way in the House and in another out of it. Mr. Sheil said he would

make no observation on what Lord Althorp had said; but the Speaker having declared that he collected from Mr. Sheil's manner that he meant to send a challenge to Lord Althorp, Mr. Sheil and Lord Althorp were called on to promise that no hostile meeting would take place. This not being agreed to, both were committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms. Subsequently, however, they were discharged. A committee was granted to Mr. Sheil, whose report entirely cleared him of the aspersions that had been cast upon his character.—*Speeches of Sheil.*

THE EARL OF SHELBURNE.

Duel Between Lord Shelburne and Colonel Fullarton.—Colonel Fullarton, member for Plympton, complained to the House, on the 20th March, 1780, of the "ungentleman-like behaviour of the Earl of Shelburne, who had in effect dared to say that he and his regiment were as ready to act against the liberties of England as against her enemies." A hostile meeting was the result, two days after, in Hyde Park. Lord Frederick Cavendish acted as second for Lord Shelburne on the occasion, and Lord Balcarras for Colonel Fullarton. "Colonel Fullarton," says the *Annual Register*, "desired Lord Shelburne to fire, which his lordship declined, and Colonel Fullarton was ordered by the seconds to fire. He fired and missed. Lord Shelburne returned it and missed. Mr. Fullarton then fired his second pistol, and hit Lord Shelburne in the right groin." The seconds interposed, but his lordship refused to deliver up his other pistol, which was still loaded. The colonel returned to his position, and repeatedly desired his lordship to fire at him; but Lord Shelburne replied, "Sure, sir, you don't think I would fire my pistol at you," and fired it in the air. Colonel Fullarton then said, "As

your lordship is wounded, and has fired in the air, it is impossible for me to go on." Hereupon the seconds declared that their principals had both behaved as men of the strictest honour. The Court of Common Council, having heard of the affair, sent officially to inquire "after his lordship's safety, endangered in consequence of his upright and spirited conduct in Parliament."

RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN.

His First Speech.—He made his first speech in Parliament on the 20th November, 1780, when a petition was presented to the House complaining of the undue election of the sitting members (himself and Mr. Monckton) for Stafford. * * * It was on this night, as Mr. Woodfall used to relate, that Mr. Sheridan, after he had spoken, came up to him in the gallery, and asked, with much anxiety, what he thought of his first attempt. The answer of Woodfall, as he had the courage afterwards to own, was, "I am sorry to say I do not think that this is your line; you had much better have stuck to your former pursuits." On hearing which, Sheridan rested his head on his hand a few minutes, and then vehemently exclaimed, "It is in me, however, and by G—— it shall come out!"—*Moore's "Sheridan."*

The "Angry Boy."—A debate occurred, February 17th, 1783, on the preliminary articles of peace, at the close of the American War of Independence, when the following passage between Pitt and Sheridan enlivened and excited the House. Mr. Pitt, says the "Parliamentary History," was pointedly severe on the gentlemen who had spoken against the Address, and particularly on Mr. Sheridan. "No man admired more than he did the abilities of that right honourable gentleman—the elegant sallies of his thought, the gay effusions of his fancy, his

dramatic turns and his epigrammatic point; and if they were reserved for the proper stage they would, no doubt, receive what the right honourable gentleman's abilities always did receive, the plaudits of the audience; and it would be his fortune *sui plausu gaudere theatri.* But this was not the proper scene for the exhibition of those elegancies." Mr. Sheridan, on rising to explain, said: "On the particular sort of personality which the right honourable gentleman has thought proper to make use of, I need not make any comment. The propriety, the taste, the gentlemanly point of it, must have been obvious to the House. But let me assure the right honourable gentleman that I do now, and will at any time he chooses to repeat this sort of allusion, meet it with the most sincere good humour. Nay, I will say more: flattered and encouraged by the right honourable gentleman's panegyric on my talents, if ever I again engage in the compositions he alludes to, I may be tempted to an act of presumption—to attempt an improvement on one of Ben Jonson's best characters—the character of the Angry Boy, in the 'Alchymist.'"

The Begums Speech.—The charge touching the spoliation of the Begums was brought forward by Sheridan, in a speech which was so imperfectly reported that it may be said to be wholly lost, but which was, without doubt, the most elaborately brilliant of all the productions of his ingenious mind. The impression which it produced was such as has never been equalled. He sat down, not merely amidst cheering, but amidst the loud clapping of hands, in which the lords below the bar and the strangers in the gallery joined. The excitement of the House was such that no other speaker could obtain a hearing, and the debate was adjourned. The ferment spread fast through the town. Within four-and-twenty hours, Sheridan was offered a thousand pounds for the copyrights of the speech, if he would himself correct it for the press. The impression made by

this remarkable display of eloquence on severe and experienced critics, whose discernment may be supposed to have been quickened by emulation, was deep and permanent. Mr. Windham, twenty years later, said the speech deserved all its fame, and was, in spite of some faults of taste—such as were seldom wanting either in the literary or in the parliamentary performances of Sheridan—the finest that had been delivered within the memory of man. Mr. Fox, about the same time, being asked by the late Lord Holland what was the best speech ever made in the House of Commons, assigned the first place, without hesitation, to the great oration of Sheridan on the Oude charge.—*Macaulay on Warren Hastings.* Nevertheless, as Lord Brougham remarks, the effect of this speech was, no doubt, owing partly to the occasion and the attendant circumstances. Although so telling at the time as an oration, it would not bear the test of perusal. Moore, who had the short-hand writer's report before him, declared it to be "trashy bombast."

An Ambiguous Compliment.—"Before my departure from England," says Gibbon, in his "Autobiography," "I was present at the august spectacle of Mr. Hastings' trial, in Westminster Hall. It is not my province to absolve or condemn the Governor of India, but Mr. Sheridan's eloquence demanded my applause; nor could I hear without emotion the personal compliment which he paid me in the presence of the British nation." The passage in the speech of the orator that afforded so much gratification to the historian is thus reported in the *Morning Chronicle*, June 14th, 1788:—"He said that the facts that made up the volume of narrative were unparalleled in atrociousness, and that nothing equal in criminality was to be traced either in ancient or modern history, in the correct periods of Tacitus, or the luminous page of Gibbon." On being asked by some one, at the conclusion of the

speech, how he came to compliment Gibbon with the epithet "luminous," Sheridan answered, in a half-whisper, "I said '*vo*luminous.'" Byron, in his "Monody on the Death of Sheridan," thus alludes to the appreciation in which a meed of praise from Sheridan was held :—

> "In whose acclaim the loftiest voices vied,
> The praised—the proud—who made his praise their pride."

An Unfettered Press.—The few sentences with which Sheridan thrilled the House on the liberty of the press, in 1810, were worth, perhaps, more than all his elaborated epigrams and forced flowers on the Begum charge, or all his denunciations of Napoleon. "Give them," said he, "a corrupt House of Lords, give them a venal House of Commons, give them a tyrannical Prince, give them a truckling Court, and let me have but an unfettered Press, I will defy them to encroach a hair's breadth upon the liberties of England."—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

His Wit and its Elaboration.—How little it was the inspiration of the moment all men were aware who knew his habits; but a singular proof of this was presented by Mr. Moore, when he came to write his "Life;" for we there find given to the world, with a frankness which must almost have made their author shake in his grave, the secret note-books of this famous wit; and we are thus enabled to trace the jokes in embryo, with which he had so often made the walls of St. Stephen's shake, in a merriment excited by the happy appearance of sudden, unpremeditated effusion. Take an instance from this author, giving extracts from the common-place book of wit:—"He employs his fancy in his narrative, and keeps his recollections for his wit." Again, the same idea is expanded into "When he makes his jokes, you applaud the accuracy of his memory, and 'tis only when he states his facts that you admire the flights of his imagination." But the thought was too good to be thus wasted on

the desert air of a common-place book. So forth it came at the expense of Kelly, who, having been a composer of music, became a wine-merchant. "You will," said the *ready* wit, "import your music and compose your wine." Nor was this service exacted from the old idea thought sufficient; so in the House of Commons an easy and apparently off-hand parenthesis was thus filled with it, at Mr. Dundas's cost and charge ("who generally resorts to his memory for his jokes, and to his imagination for his facts").—*Ibid.*

Resisting Temptation.—Once I saw Sheridan cry, after a splendid dinner. I had the honour of sitting next him. The occasion of his tears was some observation or other upon the subject of the sturdiness of the Whigs in resisting office and keeping to their principles. Sheridan turned round, "Sir, it is easy for my Lord C., or Earl G., or Marquis B., or Lord H., with thousands upon thousands a-year, some of it either presently derived or inherited in sinecure or acquisitions from the public money, to boast of their patriotism and keep aloof from temptation; but they do not know from what temptation those have kept aloof who had equal pride, at least equal talents, and not unequal passions, and nevertheless knew not in the course of their lives what it was to have a shilling of their own." And in saying this he wept.—*Byron's "Diary,"* 1821.

COLONEL SIBTHORP.

Criticism on a Royal Speech.—Colonel Sibthorp's speeches were usually brief, but extremely forcible; and he never failed to amuse the House, undesignedly, both by his matter and his manner. The following is an example from "Hansard" of his peculiar style. On the evening of the explanations which ensued upon the dismissal of Lord Palmerston by his chief, the colonel followed Lord John Russell's grave and deliberate explanation by a sudden

onslaught on the effects of the Great Exhibition of 1851. "There was," he said, "but one opinion, and it was universal, as to the gross insult which had been offered to the merchants and tradesmen of this country by the wholesale introduction of foreigners and their wares which had taken place in consequence of the Exhibition; and, for his own part, he would not for a thousand guineas enter the walls or approach within smell of the unwieldy, ill-devised, and unwholesome Castle of Glass. The speech which the ministers had put into her Majesty's lips was a mass of trickery, trash, and trumpery. It was they who were responsible for the sentiments it contained, and he sincerely hoped that the Queen would speedily escape from their fangs."

Principles before Beards.—On the adjourned debate respecting the Maynooth Grant, in the House of Commons, April 17th, 1845, Colonel Sibthorp, in opposing the measure, said: "An honourable and learned member [Mr. Serjeant Murphy] has told me that I would sooner sacrifice my principles than I would be shaved. I tell that honourable and learned gentleman that I had rather not only be shaved, but have my head shaved off, than forget I am a Protestant—born a Protestant, bred a Protestant, educated a Protestant; and God grant that I may die with similar feelings and in that faith!"—*Hansard.*

SIR RICHARD STEELE.

The "Tatler."—Steele (in alluding to Sir Thomas Hanmer's opposition to the Commercial Treaty, in 1714) said, "I rise to do him honour;" on which many members, who had before tried to interrupt him, called out "Tatler! Tatler!" And as he went down the House, several said, "It is not so easy a thing to speak in the House; he fancies, because he can scribble," &c. &c.—*Earl Russell, "The Affairs of Europe."*

Silent and Eloquent.—When Steele sat for Boroughbridge, he wittily described the House, at the time, as consisting very much of silent people oppressed by the choice of a great deal to say, and of eloquent people ignorant that what they said was nothing to the purpose.—*—Forster's Essay on Steele.*

His Expulsion from the House of Commons.—When, upon the publication of his "Crisis," which was but the sequel to those papers in the *Guardian* that led to his election for Stockbridge, the motion was made to expel him, for having "maliciously insinuated that the Protestant succession in the House of Hanover is in danger under her Majesty's administration," the Whigs rallied to his support with what strength they could. Robert Walpole and General Stanhope took their place on either side of him as he waited at the bar, and Addison prompted him throughout his spirited and temperate defence. He spoke, says one who heard him, for near three hours, with such temper, eloquence, and unconcern as gave entire satisfaction to all who were not prepossessed against him. But perhaps the most interesting occurrence of that memorable day was the speech of Lord Finch. This young nobleman, afterwards famous as a minister and orator, owed gratitude to Steele for having repelled, in the *Guardian*, a libel on his sister, and he rose to make his maiden speech in defence of her defender. But bashfulness overcame him; and after a few confused sentences he sat down, crying out as he did so, "It is strange I cannot speak for this man, though I could readily fight for him!" Upon this such cheering rang through the House, that suddenly the young lord took heart, rose again, and made the first of a long series of able and telling speeches. Of course, however, it did not save Steele, who was expelled by a majority of nearly a hundred, in a House of four hundred members.—*Ibid.*

"CHICKEN TAYLOR."

Mr. Michael Angelo Taylor, who for several years brought forward a motion in the House of Commons against Lord Eldon, was known by the *soubriquet* of "Chicken Taylor." On some points of law which arose in the House, Taylor had answered the great lawyer, Bearcroft, but not without an apology, "that he himself, who was but a young practitioner, and, as he might phrase it, *a chicken in the law*, should venture on a fight with the cock of Westminster Hall." He then acquired, and he never lost, the name of "Chicken Taylor."—*Campbell's "Chancellors."*

LORD TENTERDEN.

A Vow.—In the month of April, 1832, the parliamentary Reform Bill again came up from the Commons, and was assailed by Lord Chief Justice Tenterden, in the last speech he ever delivered in Parliament. In concluding his speech he said, "This measure, my lords, leaves nothing untouched in the existing state of the elective franchise. It goes to vest all the functions of government in the other House of Parliament; and if it were to pass, there would be nothing left for this House, or for the Crown, but to obey the mandate of the Commons. Never—never, my lords, shall I enter the doors of this House after it has become the phantom of its departed greatness." Lord Tenterden was as good as his word. After the Reform Bill received the Royal assent, he never more entered the doors of the House.—*Campbell's "Chief Justices."*

LORD THURLOW.

Leaving the Lawyer Behind.—Thurlow, then Attorney-General, took an active part, on the Government

side, in the debates which preluded the outbreak of the American colonists. It is amusing to find him declaring that he did not speak on such occasions as a lawyer; "that he always did, and always would, leave the lawyer in Westminster Hall, and be in that House only a member of Parliament."—*Campbell's "Chancellors."*

Thurlow Abashed.—Mr. Fox having moved, in 1777, for the production of certain papers relating to the American war, Thurlow, then Attorney-General, opposed the motion on behalf of the Government. The "Parliamentary History" says:—"He was contending against the ill policy of giving such information at the present critical moment, when news came from the Lords that the ministers in the Upper House had agreed to the same motion. This intelligence produced a great deal of laughter amongst the minority, and the whisper, reaching the Attorney-General, threw him into a little confusion; but, having recovered from it, he quitted the defence of the administration, and said that, 'let ministers do as they please in this or in any other House, he, as a member of Parliament, never would give his vote for making public the circumstances of a negotiation during its progress.' However, this did not stifle the laugh, which continued for some time." Lord Campbell ascribes the laughter to "the phenomenon that, for once in his life, Thurlow appeared to be abashed."

The Great Seal Stolen.—Early in the morning of the 24th of March, 1784 (says Campbell), "some thieves broke into the house of Lord Thurlow, in Great Ormond Street, which then bordered on the country. They carried off the Great Seal, two silver-hilted swords belonging to the Chancellor's officers, and a small sum of money. Though a reward was offered for their discovery, the thieves never could be traced. A charge was brought against the Whigs that, to prevent the then threatened dissolution, they had burglariously broken into the Lord Chancellor's house, and

feloniously stolen and carried off the *Clavis Regni.*" The theft and the custodian of the seal are thus alluded to in "The Rolliad":—

> "The rugged Thurlow, who, with sullen scowl,
> In surly mood, at friend and foe will growl,
> Of proud prerogative the stern support,
> Defends the entrance of Great George's court
> 'Gainst factious Whigs, lest they who stole the seal
> The sacred diadem itself should steal.
> So have I seen, near village butcher's stall
> (If things so great may be compared with small),
> A mastiff guarding on a market day,
> With snarling vigilance, his master's tray."

Thurlow's Gush of Loyalty.—The question of the Regency, on the illness of George III. in 1788, gave rise to vehement debates and much political intrigue. Lord Chancellor Thurlow's conduct in the matter is well known; he negotiated with the Whigs for the Regency, while he still occupied the woolsack for the Tories, who opposed it. On the 10th of December, 1788, Pitt presented a report to the House of Commons on the King's mental incapacity, and moved for the appointment of a committee to search for precedents. A similar motion was made the following day in the Lords. Thurlow, who by this time had come to the conclusion that his interest lay on the King's side, left the woolsack and addressed the House, concluding his speech with this exclamation—"And when I forget my King may my God forget me!" It seems scarcely possible (says Earl Stanhope, in his "Life of Pitt") to exaggerate the strong impression which that half-sentence made. Within the House itself the effect perhaps was not so satisfactory. Wilkes, who was standing under the throne, eyed the Chancellor askance, and muttered, "God forget you! He will see you d—— first!" Burke at the same moment exclaimed, with equal wit and with no profaneness, "The best thing that can happen to you!" Pitt also was on the

steps of the throne. On Lord Thurlow's imprecation he is said to have rushed out of the House, exclaiming several times, "Oh, what a rascal!" In allusion to this scene, Burke afterwards remarked in the House of Commons: "The other House were not yet, perhaps, recovered from that extraordinary burst of the pathetic which had been exhibited the other evening; they had not yet dried their eyes, or been restored to their former placidity, and were unqualified to attend to new business. The tears shed in that House, on the occasion to which he alluded, were not the tears of patriots for dying laws, but of lords for their expiring places. The iron tears which flowed down Pluto's cheek rather resembled the dismal bubbling of the Styx than the gentle murmuring streams of Aganippe."

Betrayed by his Hat.—When a council was to be held at Windsor, to determine the course which ministers should pursue (on the Regency question), Thurlow had been there some time before any of his colleagues arrived. He was to be brought back to London by one of them, and, the moment of departure being come, the Chancellor's hat was nowhere to be found. After a fruitless search in the apartment where the council had been held, a page came with the hat in his hand, saying aloud, and with great *naïveté*, "My lord, I found it in the closet of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales." The other ministers were still in the hall, and Thurlow's confusion corroborated the inference which they drew.—*Campbell's "Lives."*

A Scarecrow to the Houses.—With reference to precedents cited of the Chancellor having directed the use of the Great Seal during the King's incapacity, Burke remarked, "But what is to be done when the Crown is in a *deliquium?* It was intended, he had heard, to set up a man (Thurlow) with black brows and a large wig, a kind of scarecrow to the two Houses, who was to give a factitious assent in the royal name, and this to be binding on the people at large."

An Imposing Aspect.—Although pretending (says Lord Campbell) to despise the opinion of others, he was acting a part, and his aspect was more solemn and imposing than almost any other person's in public life—so much that Mr. Fox used to say "it proved him dishonest, since no man could *be* so wise as Thurlow *looked*."

A Masked Battery.—Speaking generally, it was only on great occasions that he signalised himself. He was a kind of *guarda costa* vessel, which cannot meet every turn and winding of a frigate that assails her, but, when the opportunity offers, pours a broadside which seldom fails of sinking the assailant. His lordship, however, possessed a weapon which he often brought into action with great skill and effect. He would appear to be ignorant upon the subject in debate, and with affected respect, but visible derision, to seek for information upon it, pointing out, with a kind of dry solemn humour, contradictions and absurdities, which he professed his own inability to explain, and calling upon his adversaries for their explanation. It was a kind of masked battery of the most searching questions and distressing observations; it often discomfited his adversary, and seldom failed to force him into a very embarrassing position of defence; it was the more effective as, when he was playing it off, his lordship showed he had the command of much more formidable artillery.—*Butler's "Reminiscences."*

A Crushing Reply.—At times Lord Thurlow was superlatively great. It was my good fortune to hear his celebrated reply to the Duke of Grafton during the inquiry into Lord Sandwich's administration of Greenwich Hospital. His grace's action and delivery when he addressed the House were singularly dignified and graceful; but his matter was not equal to his manner. He reproached Lord Thurlow with his plebeian extraction, and his recent admission into the peerage. Particular circumstances caused Lord Thurlow's reply to make a deep impression on me. His

lordship had spoken too often, and began to be heard with a civil, but visible, impatience. Under these circumstances, he was attacked in the manner we have mentioned. He rose from the woolsack, and advanced slowly to the place whence the Chancellor generally addresses the House; then, fixing on the duke the look of Jove when he grasps the thunder, "I am amazed," he said in a level tone of voice, "at the attack the noble duke has made on me. Yes, my lords"—considerably raising his voice—"I am amazed at his grace's speech. The noble duke cannot look before him, behind him, and on either side of him, without seeing some noble peer who owes his seat in this House to his successful exertions in the profession to which I belong. Does he not feel that it is as honourable to owe it to these as to being *the accident of an accident?* To all these noble lords the language of the noble duke is as applicable and as insulting as it is to myself. But I don't fear to meet it single and alone. No one venerates the peerage more than I do; but I must say, my lords, that the peerage solicited me, not I the peerage. Nay, more; I can say, and will say, that, as a peer of Parliament, as Speaker of this right honourable House, as Keeper of the Great Seal, as guardian of his Majesty's conscience, as Lord High Chancellor of England—nay, even in that character alone in which the noble duke would think it an affront to be considered—as a MAN—I am at this moment as respectable—I beg leave to add I am at this time as much respected—as the proudest peer I now look down upon." The effect of this speech, both within the walls of Parliament and out of them, was prodigious. It gave Lord Thurlow an ascendancy in the House which no Chancellor had ever possessed: it invested him, in public opinion, with a character of independence and honour; and this, though he was ever on the unpopular side in politics, made him always popular with the people. —*Ibid.*

GEORGE TIERNEY.

THE FOX AND THE GOOSE.—Mr. Tierney was one of those Whigs who, partly through hostility to Mr. Pitt, and partly from a sincere gratitude for the peace abroad, and the mild and constitutional government at home, obtained for the country by Mr. Addington, first supported and afterwards formally joined that minister, upon his rupture with his patron and predecessor. * * * When alluding to the difficulties the Foxites and Pittites had of passing over to join each other in attacking the Addington ministry, Mr. Tierney (forgetting for the moment how easily he had himself overcome a like difficulty in joining that ministry) alluded to the puzzle of "The Fox and the Goose," and did not clearly expound his idea. Whereupon Mr. Dudley North said, "It is himself he means—who left the fox to go over to the goose, and put the bag of oats in his pocket."—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

THE DUEL BETWEEN PITT AND TIERNEY.—Pitt brought in a bill for the more effectual manning of the navy, on the 25th of May, 1798, and urged that it should pass through all its stages in one day. Mr. Tierney opposed this "precipitous course." In reply Pitt asked how the honourable gentleman's opposition to the measure was to be accounted for, but from a desire to obstruct the defence of the country. Pitt refusing to retract or explain, received a challenge the next day from Mr. Tierney. Lord Sidmouth gives the following account of the preliminaries:—"I was dining with Lord Grosvenor when a note was brought me from Mr. Pitt stating that he had received a hostile message from Mr. Tierney, and wished me to go to him, which I did as soon as the party at Lord Grosvenor's broke up. Mr. Pitt had just made his will when I arrived. He had sent, in the first instance, to Mr. Steele to be his second; but, finding he was

absent, he sent next to Mr. Ryder. On the following day I went with Pitt and Ryder down the Birdcage Walk, up the steps into Queen Street, where their chaise waited to take them to Wimbledon Common." On Sunday, the 27th, at three o'clock in the afternoon (says Earl Stanhope, in his "Life of Pitt") the two parties met on Putney Heath. Mr. Pitt was attended by Mr. Dudley Ryder, afterwards Lord Harrowby, and Mr. Tierney by Mr. George Walpole. The seconds had some conversation, and endeavoured to prevent further proceedings, but they did not prevail. The principals took their ground at the distance of twelve paces, and fired at the same moment, each without effect. A second case of pistols was produced, and fired in the same manner, Mr. Pitt on this last occasion firing his pistol in the air. The seconds interfered, and thus ended the affair.

His Style in Debate.—Bulwer, in his "St. Stephen's," gives the following graphic sketch of Tierney's manner:—

"There is an eloquence which aims at talk—
A muse, though winged, that prefers to walk;
Its easy graces so content the eye,
You'd fear to lose it if it sought to fly;
Light and yet vigorous, fearless yet well bred,
As once it moved in Tierney's airy tread.
Carelessly, as a wit about the town
Chats at your table some huge proser down,
He lounged into debate, just touched a foe—
'Laughter and cheers'—A touch, sir? what a blow!
Declaiming never, with a placid smile
He bids you wonder why you are so vile;
One hand politely pointing out your crime,
The other—in his pocket all the time."

JOHN HORNE TOOKE.

His Return for Old Sarum.—Lord Camelford once took a freak to cross in a boat from Dover to Calais, while we were at war with France. The police, hearing of his

design, apprehended him. Mr. Pitt, who was his kinsman, instituted an inquiry, and in a few days ordered his release. Lord Camelford was so angry at his not giving, on hearing who it was that had been arrested, an instant order for his discharge, that he said to Horne Tooke, with whom he was well acquainted, "How can I avenge myself?" He answered that he could do it very well by putting his black servant, Mungo, into his borough of Old Sarum. Lord Camelford agreed, but the next day thought better of it, and told Horne Tooke so. "Well," said he, "then the next best thing you can do is to put *me* in." This was done, and Horne Tooke, who had in early life taken holy orders, sat till the end of that Parliament. Addington, then Prime Minister, timidly dreading his eloquent attacks, to get rid of him had a bill brought in to prevent clergymen being returned as representatives.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

The Clerical Member.—Horne Tooke entered the House on the 16th of February, 1801. He was introduced (records "Hansard") by Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Wilson. This being done, Earl Temple rose and said, "he had observed a gentleman who had just retired from the table after having taken the oaths, whom he conceived incapable of a seat in that House, in consequence of his having taken priest's orders and been inducted into a living. He should wait the allotted time of fourteen days, to see whether there was any petition presented against this return. If not, he should then move that the return for Old Sarum be taken into consideration." Three days after, the clerical member addressed the House on Mr. Sturt's motion respecting the failure of the expedition to Ferrol. In supporting the motion he said: "If the House refuse to go into a committee of inquiry, with what propriety can they enter into the merits of the borough of Old Sarum and its member? How can they plunge themselves into inquiries and discussions about what is or is not a priest, and whether a

thirty years' quarantine is not sufficient to guard against the infection of his original character? Yet, in recommending this line of conduct to the House, I sacrifice my interest to my duty, as well as I sacrifice my wishes to truth, in defending the right honourable Secretary of State—a service which he never has done, and I daresay never will do, for me." On the 10th of March, at the instance of Earl Temple, a committee of inquiry was appointed to inquire into the eligibility of persons in holy orders to sit in the House. The result was the passing of a bill (May 19th) to prevent their sitting. Before the bill passed, however, Tooke proposed an amendment, which was negatived. In support of his amendment he entertained the House with an illustrative anecdote. "He had heard of casuists splitting hairs, but this was the first instance he ever heard of a casuist splitting sacraments; and he was sure the learned gentleman (Sir W. Scott) must have borrowed the idea from a learned casuist in divinity, of whose intense research and perspicacity he would relate an anecdote. The divine alluded to wished to investigate the mystery related in the Scripture, of the legion of devils entering into a herd of swine; and, in order first to ascertain the number of devils composing a legion, he applied to his glossary, and found that a legion in the Roman army meant a certain number of men, more or less in different reigns; but he took as his medium the number as it stood in the reign of Tiberius. He next set about inquiring into the number that composed a herd of swine; and for this purpose he directed his investigations into Syria and other countries; and having taken the swineries of Mesopotamia as the most probable standard, he divided the number of a herd there by the number he had before ascertained of a legion, and the quotient proved to him that each hog was possessed of exactly a devil and a half, or somewhat less than a devil and three-quarters. The name of the divine was Dr. Small-

well, or Smallbridge, or Smallbrock;' but ever after the learned casuist was called Dr. Splitdevil."

Good Authority.—"So I understand, Mr. Tooke, you have all the blackguards in London with you," said O'Brien to him on the hustings at Westminster. "I am happy to have it, sir, on such good authority."—*S. Rogers' "Recollections."*

CHARLES TOWNSHEND.

A Logician out of Place.—When Sir P. Yorke's friend and correspondent, James Harris, took his seat in the House of Commons, Charles Townshend inquired of some member who he was; and being told in reply that he was a gentleman who had written on the subject of logic and grammar, he exclaimed, "Why does he come here, where he will hear nothing of either?"—*Harris's "Life of Hardwicke."*

A Champagne Speech.—Horace Walpole, writing to Sir Horace Mann, May 12th, 1767, mentions "a wonderful speech made by Charles Townshend last Friday, apropos to nothing, and yet about everything—about ministers, past, present, and to come—himself in particular, whom I think rather past than to come. It was all wit and folly, satire and indiscretion. He was half drunk when he made it, and yet that did but serve to raise the idea of his abilities." Writing to Miss Berry on the same subject, he says, "The speech lasted an hour, with torrents of wit, ridicule, vanity, lies, and beautiful language. Nobody but he could have made that speech; and nobody but he would have made it if they could. It was at once a proof that his abilities were superior to those of all men, and his judgment below that of any man. It showed him capable of being, and unfit to be, first minister. The House was in a roar of rapture, and some clapped their hands with ecstasy, like audience in a theatre. In this speech he beat Lord

Chatham in language, Burke in metaphors, Grenville in presumption, Rigby in impudence, himself in folly, and everybody in good humour."

SIR JOHN TREVOR.

A Squinting Speaker.—The unfortunate obliquity of Sir John Trevor's vision is perceptible in the portraits and prints we have of him. While in the chair, as Speaker, two members in different parts of the House were often equally confident of having "caught his eye."—*Campbell's "Lives."*

Royal Prerogative.—Sir John Trevor, speaking in the House of Commons on the royal prerogative of Charles II., maintained that its exercise was by no means to be inquired into by Parliament. "It is the King's prerogative," said he, "to make peace or war; 'tis he that makes it and he that breaks it. The disciples came to our Saviour in the ship, and said, 'Lord, save us, or we perish!' and we say no more to the King."—*Ibid.*

Vote of Censure on the Speaker.—In 1695 a rumour rose and spread that the funds of the City of London and the East India Company had been largely employed for the purpose of corrupting great men, and the name of Sir John Trevor, Speaker of the House of Commons, was mentioned among others. A committee was appointed to examine the books of the two corporations. Foley was placed in the chair, and within a week reported that the Speaker had, in the preceding session, received from the City a thousand guineas for expediting a local bill. As soon as the report of the committee had been read, it was moved that he had been guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour. He had to stand up and to put the question. There was a loud cry of "Ay." He called on the "noes," and scarcely a voice was heard. He was forced to declare that the "ayes" had it. A man of spirit would have given up the ghost with

remorse and shame; and the unutterable ignominy of that moment left its mark even on the callous heart and brazen forehead of Trevor. Had he returned to the House on the following day he would have had to put the question on a motion for his own expulsion. He therefore pleaded illness, and shut himself up in his bedroom. Wharton soon brought down a royal message authorising the Commons to elect another Speaker.—*Macaulay's "History."*

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE.

A Tory Physician and his Whig Patient.—During Walpole's residence at King's College, Cambridge, he was seized with the small-pox, which was of a malignant sort, and he continued for some time in imminent danger. Dr. Brady, the famous historical advocate for the Tory principles of the English constitution, who was his physician, said to one of the Fellows of King's College, warmly attached to the same party, "We must take care to save this young man, or we shall be accused of having purposely neglected him, because he is so violent a Whig." Notwithstanding Brady's political prejudices, he was so much pleased with the spirit and disposition of his young patient that he observed, with an affectionate attachment, "His singular escape seems to be a sure indication that he is reserved for important purposes."—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

Committal to the Tower.—The accusation of corruption brought against Walpole by the Commissioners of Public Accounts, was made, says Coxe ("Life of Walpole"), December 21st, 1711. They charged him with having taken two notes of hand—one for five hundred guineas, the other for five hundred pounds—while he was Secretary-at-War, for forage contracts in Scotland. In consequence of these reports he was heard in his own defence, January 17th, 1712. Ultimately the House resolved that he had been guilty of a

high breach of trust, that he should be committed to the Tower, and expelled the House. Next morning Walpole surrendered himself a prisoner, and was committed to the Tower, where he remained a prisoner till the prorogation of Parliament. A new writ having been issued for Lynn, he was re-elected; but on a petition by Samuel Taylor, the opposing candidate, the House declared Walpole incapable of serving in the present Parliament. While he remained in prison he was considered as a martyr to the cause of the Whigs, and visited by persons of the highest distinction and ability; his apartment exhibiting the appearance of a crowded levee.

Unusual Excitement.—In general his manner was simple, and even familiar, with a constant tendency towards gaiety. In vehemence of declamation he seldom indulged, and anything very violent was foreign to his habits at all times. Yet sometimes he deviated from this course, and once spoke under such excitement (on the motion respecting Lord Cadogan's conduct, 1717) that the blood burst from his nose, and he had to quit the House. But for this accidental relief, he probably would have afforded a singular instance of a speaker, always good-humoured and easy in his delivery beyond almost any other, dropping down dead in his declamation, from excess of vehemence; and at this time he was between forty and fifty years of age.—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

The Orders of the Bath and the Garter.—A few days before the prorogation of Parliament, May 31st, 1724, the Order of the Bath was revived, and Walpole was created a knight, and in 1726 he was installed Knight of the Garter; the value of which distinction is greatly enhanced by the consideration that, excepting Admiral Montague, afterwards Earl of Sandwich, he was the only commoner who, since the reign of James I., had been dignified by that order.* On

* See page 386, "The Garter in the Commons."

this event he had the honour of being congratulated by the author of the "Night Thoughts," in a poem called the "Instalment."—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

Ignorance of History.—On March 1st, 1733, Walpole's excise scheme was brought forward. A violent opponent of the measure had during the debate asserted that its object was to revive the worst practices of Empson and Dudley. So grossly ignorant of English history was the Prime Minister, that he had been obliged to ask Sir Philip Yorke, sitting by him on the Treasury Bench, "who Empson and Dudley were;" and he was afraid to trust himself (lest he should commit some ludicrous blunder) to repel the charges.—*Campbell's "Lives."*

Keyhole Tactics.—On the 21st January, 1742, Pulteney made the celebrated motion for referring to a secret committee the papers relating to the war, which had been already presented to the House. As this motion involved in it numerous charges against the conduct of the war, stated the necessity of a parliamentary inquiry, and brought on personal invectives against the minister, Sir Robert Walpole took a considerable share in the debate, and was roused to the utmost exertions. The motion was negatived by a majority of only three, in the fullest House known for many years, for 503 members voted. The efforts were so great on both sides that numbers were brought in from the chamber of sickness. Several voted in that condition on the side of opposition; but some who intended to have supported the minister were prevented from appearing at the division. They had been placed in an adjoining apartment belonging to Lord Walpole, as auditor of the Exchequer, which communicated with the House. The adversaries, aware of this fact, filled the keyhole of the door with dirt and sand, which prevented their admission into the House till the division was over. On this occasion, as General Churchill was sitting next to the

Prince of Wales, who was in the House of Commons to hear the debate, a member was brought in who had lost the use of his limbs. "So," says the prince, "I see you bring in the lame, the halt, and the blind." "Yes," replied the general, "the lame on our side, and the blind on yours."—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

The Lie Direct.—One day, in the presence of the King, Walpole was so angry at the unfounded assertion of one of these persons (the Hanoverian ministers and favourites), probably Robethon, that he exclaimed, with heat, "Mentiris impudentissime." In order to account for the use of these Latin terms, it is necessary to say, that Walpole not being able to speak French, and George I. not understanding English, all their intercourse, down to the time of the King's death, took place in the Latin language.—*Earl Russell, "The Affairs of Europe."*

Plots against his Life.—At the time of the Preston rebellion, a Jacobite, who sometimes furnished Sir Robert with intelligence, sitting alone with him one night, suddenly putting his hand into his bosom and rising, said, "Why do not I kill you now?" Walpole, starting up, replied, "Because I am a younger man, and a stronger." They sat down again, and discussed the person's information; but Sir Robert afterwards had reasons for thinking that the spy had no intention of assassination, but had hoped by intimidating to extort money from him. Yet, if no real attempt was made on his life, it was not from want of suggestions to it. One of the weekly journals pointed out Sir Robert's frequent passing Putney Bridge late at night, attended but by one or two servants, on his way to New Park, as a proper place; and after Sir Robert's death the second Earl of Egmont told me that he was once at a consultation of the Opposition, in which it was proposed to have Sir Robert murdered by a mob, of which the earl had declared his abhorrence.—*Walpole's "Reminiscences."*

Walpole's Two Drawbacks.—A friend of mine, who dined with Sir Robert Walpole one day *tête-à-tête*, took occasion to compliment him on the great honour and power which he enjoyed as Prime Minister. "Doctor," says he, "I have great power, it is true; but I have two cursed drawbacks—Hanover and the * * * avarice."—*Dr. King's "Anecdotes."*

A Grateful Supporter.—Sir Robert Walpole wanted to carry a question in the House of Commons, to which he knew there would be great opposition, and which was disliked by some of his own dependents. As he was passing through the Court of Requests he met a member of the contrary party, whose avarice, he imagined, would not reject a large bribe. He took him aside; and said, "Such a question comes on this day; give me your vote, and here is a bank bill of £2,000," which he put into his hands. The member replied, "Sir Robert, you have lately served some of my particular friends; and when my wife was last at Court, the King was very gracious to her, which must have happened at your instance. I should therefore think myself very ungrateful (putting the bank note into his pocket) if I were to refuse the favour you are now pleased to ask me."—*Ibid.*

Magnanimity.—Lord North related the following anecdote to Dr. Johnson:—Sir Robert Walpole having got into his hands some treasonable letters of his inveterate enemy, William Shippen, one of the heads of the Jacobite faction, he sent for him and burned them before his face. Some time afterwards, Shippen had occasion to take the oaths to the Government in the House of Commons, which while he was doing, Sir Robert, who stood next him and knew his principles to be the same as ever, smiled. "Egad, Robin," said Shippen, who had observed him, "that's hardly fair."—*Hawkins' "Life of Johnson."*

Even Temper.—Dr. Johnson had a high opinion of Sir

Robert Walpole, notwithstanding that he had written against him in the early part of his life. He said of him that he was a fine fellow, and that his very enemies deemed him so before his death. He honoured his memory for having kept this country in peace many years, as also for the goodness and placability of his temper. Pulteney, Earl of Bath, in a conversation with Johnson, said that Sir Robert was of a temper so calm and equal, and so hard to be provoked, that he was very sure he never felt the bitterest invectives against him for half an hour.—*Ibid.*

His Opinion of History.—Upon his retirement, in 1742, he went immediately to Houghton; but, accustomed all his life to political excitement, having never been fond of reading, and much of his old company failing, his time must have hung heavy on his hands. It is recorded that his son having one day proposed to read to him, and taking down a book of history, he exclaimed, "Oh, don't read history; that I know must be false:"—the judgment of a man better acquainted with pamphleteers than with historians.—*Earl Russell, "The Affairs of Europe."*

Inquiring after Robin.—When Walpole resigned, upon his being raised to the peerage, in 1742, the old clergyman of Walsingham, who was master of the first school in which Sir Robert was instructed, came to Houghton, and told him that he had been his first master, and had predicted that he would be a great man. Being asked why he never had called upon him while he was in power, he answered, "I knew that you were surrounded with so many petitioners, craving preferment, and that you had done so much for Norfolk people, that I did not wish to intrude. But," he added, in a strain of good-natured simplicity, "I always inquired how Robin went on, and was satisfied with your proceedings."—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

Insignificant Men.—By the fall of Walpole, Lord Bath enjoyed for some days a kind of sovereign power. But he

ruined his character; and, from a most glorious eminence, sank down to a degree of contempt. The first time Sir Robert (who was now Earl of Orford) met him in the House of Lords, he threw out this reproach: "My Lord Bath, you and I are now two as insignificant men as any in England."—*Dr. King's "Anecdotes."*

Faulty Premiers.—The Duke of Argyll said all First Ministers had been faulty, but that Sir Robert Walpole had the least faults of any minister with whom he had ever been concerned.—*Coxe's "Walpole."*

His Political Axiom.—Sir Robert Walpole is justly blamed for a want of political decorum, and for deriding public spirit, to which Pope alludes:—

> "Seen him I have, but in his happier hour
> Of social pleasure, ill exchanged for power;
> Seen him, uncumbered with the venal tribe,
> Smile without art, and win without a bribe.
> Would he oblige me? let me only find
> He does not think me what he thinks mankind."

Although it is not possible to justify him, yet this part of his conduct has been greatly exaggerated. The political axiom generally attributed, that "all men have their price," was perverted by leaving out the word "those." Flowery oratory he despised; he ascribed it to the interested views of themselves or their relatives, the declarations of pretended patriots, of whom he said, "All *those* men have their price;" and in the event many of them justified his observation.—*Ibid.*

Campbell's Character of Walpole.—Lord Campbell, in his "Lives of the Chancellors," sums up the character of Walpole in the following terms:—"After much unjust abuse heaped upon him, there seems now to be a great disposition to bestow upon him unqualified praise. He was, probably, the most dexterous party-leader we have ever had—equally skilled to win royal favour, to govern the House of Com-

mons, and to influence or be influenced by public opinion. He likewise well understood the *material* interests of the country, and, as far as was consistent with his own retention of power, he was desirous of pursuing them. But, that he might run no personal risk, he would make no attempt to improve our institutions; he was regardless of distant dangers; he plunged into a war which he admitted to be unjust and impolitic, and, by his utter neglect of literature and literary men—in spite of the example set him by his immediate predecessors, Whig and Tory—he gave to official life in England that aristocratic feeling, and vulgar, business-like tone, which it has ever since retained."

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Early Frivolity.—An Unfulfilled Prediction.—"I remember," said Lord Plunket, "being on a committee with him. The duke (then Captain Wellesley or Wesley) was, I recollect, playing with one of those toys called quizzes, the whole time of the sitting of the committee." This trait of the duke coincides perfectly with all that I have ever heard about this great man's apparent frivolity at that period of his life. Luttrell, indeed, who is about two years older than the duke, and who lived on terms of intimacy with all the Castle men of those days, has the courage to own, in the face of all the duke's present glory, that often, in speculating on the future fortunes of the young men with whom he lived, he has said to himself, in looking at Wellesley's vacant face, "Well, let who will get on in this world, *you* certainly will not!"—*Lord J. Russell, "Memoirs, &c., of Moore."*

First Appearance in the House of Lords.—The Duke of Wellington took his seat in the House of Lords for the first time on the 28th of June, 1814. "Hansard" records that a considerable concourse of persons had

assembled below the bar to witness his grace's introduction, an unusual number of peers were present, and "below the throne sat the Duchess of Wellington, and the Countess of Mornington, the venerable mother of the noble duke. His patents of creation as baron, earl, marquis, and duke, were severally read, and occupied a considerable time." The Lord Chancellor (Eldon) addressed him, to convey the thanks of the House for the services he had rendered to his sovereign and his country, and remarked, "In the execution of that duty he could not refrain from calling his attention, and that of the noble lords present, to a circumstance singular in the history of that House, that upon his introduction he had gone through every dignity of the peerage in this country which it was in the power of the Crown to bestow."

Characteristics of His Speeches.—In the House of Lords the duke was a regular attendant, and not unfrequently a speaker, but the journals of that august body supply few testimonies of our hero's excellence. His opinions and votes, excepting when his natural conservatism had not yet been sufficiently influenced by pressure from without, were rarely otherwise than soundly given, but his motives were often imperfectly expressed. It has been said that a collection of Cromwell's speeches would make the most nonsensical book in the world, and though such a remark is certainly not warranted by the orations of Wellington, yet on this point a certain resemblance is discoverable between the two great soldiers. The duke allowed himself in addressing the House to be carried away, not perhaps by his feelings, but by the impetus of a delivery which, without being either fluent or rapid, was singularly emphatic and vehement. He magnified his own opinions in order to impress them upon his hearers. If he recommended, as he did with great alacrity, a vote of thanks to an Indian general, the campaign was always "the most brilliant he had ever

known;" if he wished to stigmatise a disturbance of the peace, it was something transcending "anything he had ever seen in all his experience," though such a quality could hardly be predicated of any disorders under the sun. * * * The duke could appreciate events with unfailing nicety, but he failed in the capacity to describe them, and of late years his speeches, where they were not tautology, were often contradictions. Nor could the failing be traceable to age alone, for it was observed, though in a less degree, during the earlier stages of his career, and is the more remarkable from the contrast presented by his despatches.—*Memoir, from the "Times."*

An Undesigned Effect.—When at the meeting of Parliament, Nov. 3rd, 1830, the Duke of Wellington declared that the constitution of the House of Commons was perfect, and that the wit of man could not *à priori* have devised anything so good, the general feeling was one of dismay. The House of Lords, usually so calm, showed signs of amazement and perturbation. The duke whispered to one of his colleagues, "What can I have said which seems to make so great a disturbance?" "You have announced the fall of your Government, that is all," replied his more clear-sighted colleague.—*Earl Russell, Introduction to "Speeches."*

The King not a Gentleman.—When Lord Liverpool was forming his administration in 1822, he insisted on the necessity of offering the Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs to Mr. Canning, and impressed his opinions on this subject so strongly on the Duke of Wellington, that his grace, though he had some prejudices of his own to conquer, undertook to vanquish those of his Majesty against Mr. Canning's appointment. A lady who was an intimate friend of George IV., and at that moment of the duke also, and who was then staying at Brighton, told me that the duke went down to Brighton and held an interview with the King, and she related to me parts of a conversation which, according to

her, took place on this occasion. "Good God! Arthur, you don't mean to propose to me that fellow as Secretary for Foreign Affairs; it is impossible! I said, on my honour as a gentleman, he should never be one of my ministers again. You hear, Arthur; on my honour as a gentleman! I am sure you will agree with me that I can't do what I said on my honour as a gentleman I would not do." "Pardon me, sire; I don't agree with you at all. Your Majesty is not a gentleman." The King started. "Your Majesty, I say," continued the imperturbable soldier, "is not a gentleman, but the Sovereign of England, with duties to your people far above any to yourself; and these duties render it imperative that you should at this time employ the abilities of Mr. Canning." "Well!" drawing a long breath, "if I must, I must," was finally the King's reply.—*Sir H. Bulwer's "Historical Characters."* Sir Henry adds, in a note, that the accuracy of the story having been disputed, he had it in some measure confirmed by Lady Palmerston; but he thinks that, like most tales of a similar nature, it probably had some foundation, although not precisely correct either in details or date.

The Duke and Mr. Huskisson.—In 1828, when the Duke of Wellington was Prime Minister, "the question of Parliamentary Reform was brought under discussion upon a motion to disfranchise the two boroughs of Penryn and East Retford, and invest Manchester and Birmingham with the electoral privileges thus vacated. In the course of the contest a division was taken on the particular substitution of Birmingham for East Retford. Government said 'No' to the proposal, but Mr. Huskisson, though still Colonial Secretary, had managed to commit himself to an affirmative vote. Confused at his position, he sent the duke what was either a resignation or an offer of resignation, and what the duke chose to think was the former. There was, in plain truth, but little cordiality between them. Unpleasant

jars had occurred already. Mr. Huskisson had publicly assured his Liverpool constituents that he had not entered the new administration without a 'guarantee' for the general adjustment of its policy by that of Mr. Canning. This sounded as if a 'pledge' had been exacted and given —an idea which the duke indignantly repudiated, and parliamentary explanations had to be offered before the matter could be set at rest. So this time the difference was made final. In vain did the common friends and colleagues of the two statesmen endeavour to 'explain' the unlucky communication. The duke, in terms which passed into proverbial use, replied that there 'was no mistake, could be no mistake, and should be no mistake.' He was not sorry, in fact, that so convenient an opportunity had been created in his hand. Mr. Huskisson therefore retired."—"*Times*" *Memoir.*

The Duel between the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Winchilsea.—The duke incurred great odium by the measure for Catholic Emancipation, which he had formerly opposed. The duel which arose out of it is thus referred to in the "Memoir" of the duke, reprinted from the *Times*, and attributed, when published, to the pen of Macaulay:—"One episode of the history is too remarkable to be omitted. The duke had been chosen patron of the new collegiate institution in the Strand, which, under the name of King's College, was destined to combat the rival seminary in Gower Street. On the disclosure of the ministerial policy, Lord Winchilsea, writing to a gentleman connected with the new establishment, spoke of the duke and his patronship in these terms:—'Late political events have convinced me that the whole transaction was intended as a blind to the Protestant and High Church party, that the noble duke, who had for some time previous to that period determined upon breaking in upon the constitution of 1688, might the more effectually, under the cloak of some

outward show of zeal for the Protestant religion, carry on his insidious designs for the infringement of our liberties and the introduction of Popery into every department of the State.' These expressions, coming from such a quarter, appeared to the duke to call for personal notice, and, after a vain essay of explanations, the Prime Minister of England, attended by Sir Henry Hardinge, and the Earl of Winchilsea, attended by Lord Falmouth, met in Battersea Fields on the 21st of March (1829), in full session, to discharge loaded pistols at each other on a question concerning the Protestant religion. The life of the great captain, however, was not exposed to danger. Lord Winchilsea, after receiving the duke's shot, fired in the air, and then tendered the apology in default of which the encounter had occurred." Mr. Gleig mentions that "when the moment for action arrived, it was found that the duke did not possess a case of duelling pistols."

The Premier and the Commons.—On Lord Althorp, who had been leader of the House of Commons, being summoned to the House of Lords, through the death of his father, in November, 1834, the Duke of Wellington was authorised to form a new Cabinet. Summoned to Brighton, the old leader of the Tories gave a great example at once of modesty and power. "It is not to me," he told the King, "but to Sir Robert Peel that your Majesty must apply to form a Cabinet; and to him it belongs to direct it. The difficulty and the predominance are in the House of Commons; the leader of that House must be at the head of the Government. I will serve under him in any post which your Majesty may please to entrust to me."—*Guizot's "Memoirs of Peel."*

"The Queen's Government must be Supported."—When the Corn Laws Abolition Act came to the House of Lords, I said to Lyndhurst that he was bound to defend it. "No," answered he, "this is unnecessary, for the Duke

of Wellington has secured a majority in its favour, although he thinks as badly of it as I should have done seven years ago. Thus he addressed a Protectionist peer, who came to lament to him that he must on this occasion vote against the Government, having such a bad opinion of the bill—'Bad opinion of the bill, my lord! You can't have a worse opinion of it than I have; but it was recommended from the Throne, it has passed the Commons by a large majority, and we must all vote for it. The Queen's Government must be supported!'"—*Campbell's "Life of Lyndhurst."*

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

Slave Trade Motions.—"In 1787," said Wilberforce, "I was staying with Pitt, at Holwood—one has often a local recollection of particular incidents—and I distinctly remember the very knoll upon which I was sitting, near Pitt and Grenville, when the former said to me, 'Wilberforce, why don't you give notice of a motion on the subject of the slave trade? You have already taken great pains to collect evidence, and are therefore fully entitled to the credit which doing so will insure you. Do not lose time, or the ground may be occupied by another.' I did so, and upon that occasion Fox said he had himself seriously entertained the idea of bringing the subject before Parliament; but he was pleased to add that, it having got into so much better hands, he should not interfere. In 1789 I opened the question to the House. Burke, I remember, complimented me on my speech, and thanked me for the information he had received from it." As an instance of the ridiculous stories told in consequence to his disadvantage, Clarkson was travelling in a stage-coach, when, the conversation turning on the abolition question, one of the passengers gravely said, "Mr. Wilberforce is doubtless a great philanthropist in public, but I happen to know a little of his private history, and can assure

you that he is a cruel husband, and even beats his wife." At this time Mr. Wilberforce was a bachelor.—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

His Parliamentary Dinners.—Mr. Wilberforce resided in Palace Yard for some time with his friend, Mr. Henry Thornton, as bachelors, where they kept an almost open house for members of Parliament. About three o'clock daily their friends began to drop in on their way to the House, and partook of a light dinner, the number of them amounting to seventeen or twenty. Lord Eldon was not unfrequently one of the party. "It delighted us," said Mr. Wilberforce, "to see our friends in this way, especially as it gave us the opportunity of talking upon any important points of public business, without any great sacrifice of time. Those who came in late put up with a mutton chop or beefsteak. The Duke of Montrose called in one day as we were thus employed, but declined taking anything. Seeing, however, so many around him busy with the knife and fork, he said, 'I cannot resist any longer,' and down he sat to a mutton chop. 'Ah! duke,' said I, 'if your French cook could see you now, he would be quite affronted.'"—*Ibid.*

Power and Forbearance.—The singular kindness, the extreme gentleness of his disposition, wholly free from gall, from vanity, or any selfish feeling, kept him from indulging in any of the vituperative branches of rhetoric; but a memorable instance showed that it was anything rather than the want of power which held him off from the use of the weapons so often in almost all other men's hands. When a well-known and popular member thought fit to designate him repeatedly, and very irregularly, as the "honourable and religious gentleman," not because he was ashamed of the Cross he gloried in, but because he felt indignant at any one in the British Senate deeming piety a matter of imputation, he poured out a strain of sarcasm which none who heard it

can ever forget. A common friend of the parties having remarked to Sir Samuel Romilly, beside whom he sat, that this greatly outmatched Pitt himself, the master of sarcasm, the reply of that great man and just observer was worthy to be remarked—"Yes," said he, "it is the most striking thing I almost ever heard; but I look upon it as a more singular proof of Wilberforce's virtue than of his genius, for who but he ever was possessed of such a formidable weapon, and never used it?"—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

A Simile.—"Few passages can be cited," says Brougham, "in the oratory of modern times of a more electrical effect than Wilberforce's singularly felicitous and striking allusion to Mr. Pitt's resisting the torrent of Jacobin principles: 'He stood between the living and the dead, and the plague was stayed.'"

Repenting of his Vote.—Lord Sidmouth told us that one morning at a Cabinet meeting, after an important debate in the House of Commons (the subject of which he had forgotten) some one said, "I wonder how Wilberforce voted last night." On which Lord Liverpool observed, "I do not know how he voted; but this I am pretty sure of, that in whatever way he voted, he repents of his vote this morning." Lord Sidmouth added, "It was odd enough that I had no sooner returned to my office than Wilberforce was announced, who said, 'Lord Sidmouth, you will be surprised at the vote I gave last night, and, indeed, I am not myself altogether satisfied with it!' To which I replied, 'My dear Wilberforce, I shall never be surprised at any vote you may give.' Pursuing the conversation, I soon convinced him that he had really voted wrong, when he said, 'Dear me, I wish I had seen you last night before the debate.'"—*Life of Lord Sidmouth.*

JOHN WILKES.

Wilkes as a Speaker.—If we are to judge of his speaking by the very few samples preserved of it, we should indeed form a very humble estimate of its merits. Constant declamation about rights, and liberties, and tyrants, and corruption, with hardly the merit of the most ordinary common-places on these hackneyed topics, seem to fill up its measure—with neither fact, nor argument, nor point, nor anything at all happy or new in the handling of the threadbare material. But what it wanted in force it probably made up in fury; and as calling names is an easy work to do, the enraged multitude as easily are pleased with what suits their excited feelings, gratifying the craving which excitement produces for more stimulus. That he failed, and signally failed, whenever he was called upon to address an audience which rejects such matter, is very certain. In Parliament he was seldom or never heard after his own case had ceased to occupy the public attention; and nothing can be worse than his address to the Court of Common Pleas when he was discharged. The occasion, too, on which he failed was a great one, when a victory for a constitutional principle had been gained perhaps by him—certainly in his person. All the people of London were hanging on the lips of their leader; yet nothing could be worse or feebler than his speech, of which the burden was a topic as much out of place as possible in a court of justice, where the strict letter of the law had alone prevailed, and that topic was verily handled with miserable inefficiency. "Liberty, my lords, liberty has been the object of my life! Liberty——" and so forth. He might about as well have sung a song, or lifted his hat and given three cheers.—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

A Newspaper Speech.—He spoke a speech in Parliament of which no one heard a word, and said aside to a

friend, who urged the fruitlessness of the attempt at making the House listen—"Speak it I must, for it has been printed in the newspapers this half hour."—*Ibid.*

His Patriotism.—In public he affected a patriotism which he was far from feeling—indeed, he rather made a boast of his insincerity. Standing on the hustings at Brentford, his opponent said to him, "I will take the sense of the meeting." "And I will take the nonsense," replied Wilkes, "and we shall see who has the best of it." Some years after, when his popularity had declined, the King, receiving him at his levee, asked him after his friend Serjeant Glyn. "Sir," said Wilkes, "he is not a friend of mine; he was a Wilkite, which I never was."—*Russell's "Life of Fox."*

Ready for Anything.—Colonel Luttrell and he were standing on the Brentford hustings, when he asked his adversary privately whether he thought there were more fools or rogues among the multitude of Wilkites spread out before them. "I'll tell them what you say, and put an end to you," said the colonel; but perceiving the threat gave Wilkes no alarm, he added, "Surely you don't mean to say you could stand here one hour after I did so?" "Why," the answer was, "*you* would not be alive one instant after." "How so?" "I should merely say it was a fabrication, and they would destroy you in the twinkling of an eye!"—*Brougham's "Historical Sketches."*

Two Opinions.—At one time Mr. Wilkes came up to the Speaker in the chair, and told him that he had a petition to present to the House from a set of the greatest scoundrels and miscreants upon earth. When called upon, however, shortly afterwards to present it, he said, with the gravest possible face, "Sir, I hold in my hand a petition from a most intelligent, independent, and enlightened body of men."—*Life of Lord Sidmouth.*

Strong Language.—Duel Between Wilkes and Martin.—While the House of Commons was debating the

complaint of the King against the *North Briton*, in 1763, an incident arose which is thus referred to by Horace Walpole, in his letters to Mann: "One Mr. Martin, who has much the same quarrel with Mr. Wilkes as King George, and who chose to suspend his resentment, like his Majesty, till with proper dignity he could notify his wrath to Parliament, did express his indignation with rather less temper than the King had done, calling Mr. Wilkes to his face 'cowardly scoundrel.' Mr. Wilkes inquired of Mr. Martin by letter next morning if he, Mr. Wilkes, was meant by him, Mr. Martin, under this periphrasis. Mr. Martin replied in the affirmative, and accompanied his answer with a challenge. They immediately went into Hyde Park, and, at the second fire, Mr. Wilkes received a bullet in his body." The wound, however, was not very serious.

WILLIAM WINDHAM.

A Promising Novice.—In 1783 Mr. Windham was appointed principal secretary to Lord Northington, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Before leaving England he called upon his friend Dr. Johnson, to whom he expressed, says Boswell, some modest and virtuous doubts whether he could bring himself to practice those arts which it is supposed a person in that situation has occasion to employ. "Don't be afraid, sir," said Johnson, with a pleasant smile; "you will soon make a very pretty rascal."

A Very Palpable Hit.—Sometimes he would convulse the House by a happy, startling, and most unexpected allusion; as when on the Walcheren question, speaking of a *coup-de-main* on Antwerp, which had been its professed object, he suddenly said, "A *coup-de-main* in the Scheldt! You might as well talk of a *coup-de-main* in the Court of Chancery." Sir William Grant (Master of the Rolls) having just entered and taken his seat, probably suggested this

excellent jest; and assuredly no man enjoyed it more. His habitual gravity was overpowered in an instant, and he was seen absolutely to roll about on the bench which he had just occupied.—*Brougham's "Statesmen."*

Homely Saxon.—"When some phrase of his," says Lord Brougham, "long after it was first used, seemed to invite attack, and a great cheer followed, as if he had unwittingly fallen into the scrape, he stopped and added, 'Why, I said it on purpose!' or, as he pronounced it, 'a purpose;' for no man more delighted in the old pronunciation, as well as the pure Saxon idiom of our language, which yet he could enrich and dignify with the importations of classical phraseology."

Convenient Illustration.—Windham's happiness in illustration was thus alluded to by Lord John Russell, in speaking on Parliamentary Reform in 1854:—"I know to those who do not like the measure a fit time is always wanting. Mr. Windham, who was a great master of illustration and allusion, when a measure of reform was introduced in a time of public quiet and peace, said, 'You are like the man in the *Spectator*, who had every symptom of the gout except the pain; you are going to deal with a disease that causes you no inconvenience.' Times changed, and there was a vast deal of commotion, and agitation, and excitement, and still Mr. Windham opposed reform, saying, 'Surely you will not repair your house in a hurricane!' On both occasions he was ready with an illustration, and so it is with many of those who now say that this is not the time to introduce a measure of Parliamentary reform."

PART III.

MISCELLANEOUS.

ELECTIONS

EARLY ELECTION DISTURBANCES.—In the eighth and tenth of Henry VI., laws were enacted limiting the electors to such as were possessed of forty shillings a year in land, free from all burdens, within the county. The preamble of one statute is remarkable: "Whereas the elections of knights have of late, in many counties of England, been made by outrages and excessive numbers of people, many of them of small substance and value, yet pretending to a right equal to the best knights and esquires; whereby manslaughters, riots, batteries, and divisions among the gentlemen and other people of the same counties shall very likely rise and be, unless due remedy be provided in this behalf," &c. We may learn from these expressions what an important matter the election of a member of Parliament was now become in England.—*Hume.*

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.—John Selden says, "There was a time when all men had their voice in choosing Knights. About Henry the Sixth's time they found the inconvenience, so one Parliament made a law, that only he that had forty shillings per annum should give his voice; they under should be excluded. They made the law who had the voice of all, as well under forty shillings as above; and thus it continues at

this day. All consent civilly to a Parliament; women are involved in the men, children in those of perfect age, those that are under forty shillings a year in those that have forty shillings a year, those of forty shillings in the Knights."—*Table Talk.*

A Sheriff Assaulted for Delaying a Writ.—Richard Calle writes to John Paston about 1450: "I recommend me unto your good mastership; like you to weet (know) that on Childermas Day there were much people at Norwich at the shire (county court), because it was noised in the shire that the under-sheriff had a writ to make a new election, wherefore the people was grieved because they had laboured so often, saying to the sheriff that he had the writ, and plainly he should not away unto the time the writ were read. The sheriff answered and said that he had no writ, nor wist who had it; hereupon the people peaced and stilled unto the time the shire was done, and after that done, the people called upon him, 'Kill him! head him!' and so John Damme, with help of others, got him out of the shire-house, and with much labour brought him into Spurrier Row, and there the people met against him, and so they avoided him into an house, and kept fast the door unto the time the mayor was sent for, and the sheriff, to strengthen him and to convey him away, or else he had been slain. Wherefore divers of the thrifty men came to me, desiring that I should write unto your mastership to let you have understanding of the guiding of the people, for they be full sorry of this trouble; and that it please you to send them your advice how they shall be guided and ruled, for they were purposed to have gathered an hundred or two hundred of the thriftiest men, and to have come up to the King to let the King have understanding of their mocking."—*Fenn's "Paston Letters."*

Influence of Peers on Elections.—The following letter, written about the middle of the 15th century, and included in the Paston series, shows the influence then

exercised by peers in elections for the Lower House, and the estimation in which members of that House were at that time held: "The Duchess of Norfolk to our right trusty and well-beloved John Paston, Esq. We greet you heartily well, and forasmuch as it is thought right necessary for diverse causes that my lord have at this time in the Parliament such persons as belong unto him, and be of his menial servants; wherein we conceive your goodwill and diligence shall be right expedient; we heartily desire and pray you that, at the contemplation of these our letters, as our special trust is in you, ye will give and apply your voice unto our right well-beloved cousin and servants, John Howard and Sir Roger Chamberlayn, to be knights of the shire; exhorting all such others as by your wisdom shall now be behoveful, to the good exploit and conclusion of the same. And in your faithful attendance and true devoir in this part ye shall do unto my lord and us a singular pleasure, and cause us hereafter to thank you therefore, as ye shall hold you right well content and agreed with the grace of God, who have you ever in his keeping."—*Ibid.*

Court Dictation.—The writs issued to summon a Parliament in 1553 were accompanied by a letter in the King's name (Edward VI.) to each sheriff, which concluded as follows:—"Our pleasure is that where our Privy Council, or any of them, shall recommend men of learning and wisdom, in such case their directions be regarded and followed, to have this assembly to be of the most chiefest men in our realm for advice and good counsel."—*Parliamentary History.*

The "Prince Elector."—*March* 5, 1685 (a few days after the accession of James II.).—A Parliament was now summon'd, and greate industry us'd to obtaine elections which might promote the Court interest, most of the corporations being now by their new charters impower'd to make what returnes of members they pleas'd. *May* 22.—

Mr. Seymour made a bold speech against many elections, and would have had those members who (he pretended) were obnoxious, to withdraw, till they had clear'd the matter of their being legally return'd; but no one seconded him. The truth is, there were many of the new members whose elections and returns were universally censur'd, many of them being persons of no condition or interest in the nation, or places for which they serv'd, especially in Devon, Cornwall, Norfolk, &c., said to have been recommended by the Court, and from the effect of the new charters changing the electors. It was reported that Lord Bath carried down with him into Cornwall no fewer than fifteen charters, so that some call'd him the Prince Elector.—*Evelyn's "Diary."*

A Court Candidate in the Seventeenth Century. —Sir John Reresby, Governor of the city of York in the reign of James II., gives in his "Memoirs" the following account of the mode in which the Court manipulated the constituencies for the purpose of securing the return of its own nominees:—"I sent notice to the mayor and others of York that I intended to stand for one of their representatives at the ensuing election, and found the magistracy would be for the most part against me, though I had good encouragement from the other citizens. The truth is I was at some loss how to act in this matter; I was not desirous to be of this Parliament, not only because I was grown infirm and unfit to attend the duty of the House, but also because I was afraid the King would expect more from me than my conscience would extend to; for, as I was determined not to violate this on the one side, so I could hardly resolve to offend so good a master on the other. In these straits I went to the King at Windsor, and showed him the letters I had sent to York, and the answers I had received thereto; desiring his Majesty to indulge me with replies to three queries I had to make. (1.) Whether,

seeing the contest was like to be both chargeable and difficult, and the success extremely doubtful, it was his pleasure I should stand? He replied positively, I should. (2.) Whether, as the opposition was very strong against me, he would impute it to my remissness if I miscarried? He promised he would not. (3.) Whether he would assist me all he could to prevent my being baffled, and particularly by such means as I should propose to him? His answer was, Yes; and he gave immediate orders to the Lords for purging of Corporations, to make whatever change I desired in the city of York, and to put in or out (which the King, it seems, had reserved to himself by the last charter) just as I pleased. Then, taking leave of the King, and presenting him with some Roman medals, which he took very kindly, he again charged me to do what I could to be chosen." The worthy knight proceeds to narrate the steps he took to carry out the King's wishes; but in the meantime the Prince of Orange landed—an event by which these and many more important schemes were rendered futile.

Electioneering Strategy in 1685.—The Whig candidate (for Buckinghamshire), Thomas Wharton, eldest son of Philip Lord Wharton, was a man distinguished alike by dexterity and by audacity, and destined to play a conspicuous, though not always a respectable part, in the politics of several reigns. He had been one of those members of the House of Commons who had carried up the Exclusion Bill to the bar of the Lords. The Court was therefore bent on throwing him out by fair or foul means. The Lord Chief Justice Jeffreys himself came down into Buckinghamshire, for the purpose of assisting a gentleman named Hacket, who stood on the high Tory interest. A stratagem was devised which, it was thought, could not fail of success. It was given out that the polling would take place at Ailesbury; and Wharton, whose skill in all the arts of electioneering was unrivalled, made his arrangements on that supposition. At

a moment's warning the sheriff adjourned the poll to Newport Pagnell. Wharton and his friends hurried thither, and found that Hacket, who was in the secret, had already secured every inn and lodging. The Whig freeholders were compelled to tie their horses to the hedges, and to sleep under the open sky in the meadows which surround the little town. It was with the greatest difficulty that refreshments could be procured at such short notice for so large a number of men and beasts, though Wharton, who was utterly regardless of money when his ambition and party spirit were roused, disbursed fifteen hundred pounds in one day, an immense outlay for those times. Injustice seems, however, to have animated the courage of the stout-hearted yeomen of Bucks, the sons of the constituents of John Hampden. Not only was Wharton at the head of the poll; but he was able to spare his second votes to a man of moderate opinions, and to throw out the Chief Justice's candidate.—*Macaulay's "History."*

The First Conviction for Bribery.—In the session of 1571, a fine was imposed on the borough of Westbury, for receiving a bribe of four pounds from Thomas Long, "being a very simple man and of small capacity to serve in that place;" and the mayor was ordered to repay the money. Long, however, does not seem to have been expelled. This is the earliest precedent on record for the punishment of bribery in elections.—*Hallam's "Constitutional History."* In recent times we have an instance of a somewhat heavy penalty falling upon a constituency for corrupt practices at an election, as the following statement from the *Times* of 6th March, 1871, will show:—"The Bridgewater Town Council were on Friday informed that they would have to pay £3,146 as the cost of their election commission. It was stated that the payment would necessitate a rate of 2s. 6d. in the pound."

Magisterial Delinquents.—In 1767, Philip Ward,

Esq., Mayor of Oxford, in conjunction with several other magistrates of the city, wrote a letter to Sir Thomas Stapylton and the Hon. Robert Lee, their members, offering to elect them again at the next general election for a stated sum of money. The letter was produced in the House; whereupon the writers were ordered to be arrested and committed to Newgate. After a confinement of some time, they were discharged, upon petitioning the House, having first been reprimanded on their knees by the Speaker.—*Oldfield's "History."*

Time for Reflection.—Alexander Davidson, Esq., the opulent banker and contractor; John White Parsons, and Thomas Hopping, gents., have been sentenced by the Court of King's Bench, for gross bribery and corruption at the late Ilchester election, to twelve months' confinement in the Marshalsea prison.—*Annual Register*, 1804.

A Heavy Punishment for Bribery.—On March 18th, 1819, Sir Manasseh Lopez, Bart., was tried and convicted, and sentenced to pay a fine of £10,000, and to be imprisoned in Exeter Gaol for two years, for bribing several of the electors of the borough of Grampound. With reference to this case, Lord John Russell moved in the House of Commons (July 11th, 1820) that the House should address the Throne to remit part of the punishment. The motion, after some discussion, was withdrawn.—*Annual Register.*

Origin of Conveyance of Electors and Splitting Freeholds for Votes.—In January, 1679, the Parliament, which had been in existence ever since the beginning of the year 1661, was dissolved, and writs were issued for a general election. During some weeks the contention over the whole country was fierce and obstinate beyond example. Unprecedented sums were expended. New tactics were employed. It was remarked by the pamphleteers of that time as something extraordinary that horses were hired at a great charge for the conveyance of electors. The practice of splitting

freeholds for the purpose of multiplying votes, dates from this memorable struggle.—*Macaulay's "History."*

Wholesale Multiplication of Freeholds.—A committee was appointed to try the petition of John Arbuthnot, Esq., on the 10th February, 1804, against the return of certain candidates for Weymouth. In consequence of the decision of this committee, two hundred freeholds were at once split into two thousand. Freeholders of Weymouth were to be found in London, and in almost all the towns and villages to the Land's End in Cornwall, and in the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, whence many hundreds were afterwards brought at an enormous expense to vote at every election for this borough. Some even voted for the thirteen-hundredth part of a sixpenny freehold.—*Oldfield's "Representative History."*

Honorary Freemen.—In the East Retford case, decided in the Court of King's Bench in 1802, it appeared to have been the custom for two hundred and twenty years for the sheriffs and aldermen to make whom they pleased freemen, for the purpose of creating voters, till they became so confident of their possessing such a power that they proceeded to create forty-two honorary freemen at one time. This caused an information in the nature of a *quo warranto* to be filed within six years, as the statute limits such information to that period after they obtain the freedom of any corporation. Upon hearing the same, the bailiffs and aldermen pleaded a custom of two hundred and twenty years. Upon which it was observed that it had been also customary to rob upon the highway for so many years, but that it was always the custom to hang the offender when he was detected. Judgment of *ouster* was issued against the whole forty-two honorary freemen. — *Oldfield's "Representative History."*

Election for Norfolk Two Hundred Years Ago.—Sir Thomas Browne, the learned physician of Norwich,

writing to his son Edward, then a member of the College of Physicians and residing in London, gives the following account of the election of representatives for the shire of Norfolk :—"Norwich, May 7th, 1679. Our election was the last Monday. The competitors were the former elected Sir Christopher Calthorp and Sir Neuille Catelyn, and Sir John Hobart and Mr. Windham. I neuer obserued so great a number of people who came to giue their voyces; but all was ciuilly carried at the hill, and I do not heare of any rude or vnhandsome caryadge, the competitors hauing the weeke before sett downe rules and agreed upon articles for their regular and quiet proceeding. They came not down from the hill vntill eleven o'clocke at night. Sir John Hobart and Sir Neuille Catelyn caryed it, and were caryed on chayres about the market-place after eleuen o'clocke, with trumpets and torches, candles being lighted at windowes, and the markett-place full of people. I could not butt obserue the great number of horses which were in the towne, and conceive there might haue been fiue or six thousand which in time of need might serue for dragoone horses; besides a great number of coach horses, and very good sadle horses of the better sort. Wine wee had none butt sack and Rhenish, except some made prouision thereof before hand; butt there was a strange consumption of beere and bread and cakes. Abundance of people slept in the markett-place, and laye like flockes of sheep in and about the crosse."—*Browne's "Domestic Correspondence."*

Letting Loose the Tap.—Roger North, in his "Life of Lord Keeper Guilford," relates that "Mr. Coke, of Norfolk, succeeded Sir Francis North in the burgess-ship of Lynn (1685), but not so easy and cheap; for his managers did not keep in due bounds, but let loose the tap all over that large town, and made an account of £7,000 or more resting due to the town, besides what had been paid for the expenses."

A Dinner to Voters.—The following is an exact account of the articles consumed at dinner only by the voters of a small borough on the day of electing their members; independent of veal, mutton, poultry, pastry, &c., and a preparatory breakfast, which last alone amounted to £750. Consumption at dinner:—980 stone of beef; 315 dozen of wine; 72 pipes of ale; and 365 gallons of spirits converted into punch.—*Annual Register*, 1761.

The Fat and the Lean Voters.—Frederick Douglas, Lady Glenbervie's son, sat in Parliament for the family borough of Banbury, and amused us one day by telling what had formerly occurred to some recreant electors, who had ventured, though vainly, to oppose Lord North's nomination of the mayor, shortly before the annual dinner, to which his lordship was in the habit of sending venison. The old steward, while carving it, sent plenty of fat to the obedient voters, but made the rebels feelingly sensible of his displeasure, by exclaiming as he dispatched their respective plates, "Those who didn't vote for my lord's Mayor sha'n't have none of my lord's fat!"—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

A Call for Reform.—John Evelyn thus writes, in 1696, to Lord Godolphin, First Commissioner of the Treasury:—"Truly, my lord, I cannot but wonder and even stand amaz'd that Parliaments should have sate from time to time, so many hundred yeares, and value their constitution to that degree as the most sovraine remedy for the redresse of publiq grievances, whilst the greatest still remaine unreform'd and untaken away. Witnesse the confus'd, debauch'd, and riotous manner of electing members qualified to become the representatives of a nation, with legislative power to dispose of the fate of kingdomes; which should and would be compos'd of worthy persons, of known integritie and ability in their respective countries, and still would serve them generously, and as their ancestors have don, but are

not able to fling away a son or daughter's portion to bribe the votes of a drunken multitude, more resembling a pagan bacchanalia than an assembly of Christians and sober men met upon the most solemn occasion that can concerne a people, and stand in competition with some rich scrivener, brewer, banker, or one in some gainfull office whose face or name, perhaps, they never saw or knew before. How, my lord, must this sound abroad! With what dishonour and shame at home!"

A Simple Ceremony.—Formerly, says Waller (1673), the neighbourhood desired a candidate to serve; there was a dinner, and so an end; but now it is a kind of an empire. Some hundred years ago, some boroughs sent not; they could get none to serve; but now it is in fashion, and a fine thing they are revived.—*Parliamentary History.*

An Election in Oxfordshire. — The Oxfordshire election petition in 1754 was the cause of great party animosities. The sheriff returned all the four candidates, and they all petitioned, complaining of undue election and double return. After a very long debate, on the 18th of November and on many subsequent days, it was eventually decided that Lord Parker and Sir Edward Turner were the sitting members, and that Lord Wenman and Sir James Dashwood had not been duly elected. The sum of money spent on this occasion was enormous. Walpole writes to Sir Horace Mann: "A knowing lawyer said to-day that, with purchasing tenures, votes, and carrying on the election and petition, £55,000 will not pay the whole expense."—*Note in "Grenville Papers."*

An Election in Yorkshire.—In 1807 the most expensive contest took place for the representation of Yorkshire that ever distinguished the annals of electioneering. The candidates were Lord Viscount Milton, son of Lord Fitzwilliam, supported by the Whig party; the Hon. Henry Lascelles, son of Lord Harewood, proposed by the Tories;

and William Wilberforce, Esq., on the Dissenting and Independent interest. The election was carried on with doubtful success between the two party candidates for fifteen days, but Mr. Wilberforce was at the head of the poll for the whole time. It terminated in favour of Mr. Wilberforce and Lord Milton. This contest is said to have cost the three parties near half a million of money. The expenses of Mr. Wilberforce were defrayed by public subscription; and such public zeal was manifested in his favour, that more than double the sum necessary was raised in a few days, and one moiety was afterwards returned to the subscribers. — *Oldfield's "Representative History."*

Election Expenses in 1865.—In a speech at Glasgow on Reform, in October, 1866, Mr. Bright said:—"With regard to a general election, some of you have read, and many of you know something of the cost and corruption of a general election. I will give you one instance and one proof of it. It has been my opinion all along that it was the duty of the Government of Lord Russell, after the defeat of their Reform Bill during the last session, to have dissolved the Parliament. I have no reason to disbelieve what is asserted, that Lord Russell himself was of that opinion. But a general election was a burden which the members of Parliament did not wish to bear. I was speaking to a member of the Government on this question, about the time when the resignation of the late Government was just about to be submitted to the Queen, and I was telling him that I thought the true policy, the constitutional policy, of the Government was to dissolve the Parliament. A portion of his answer was this:—A member who sits on our side of the House had spoken to him about it. He said, 'My election has already cost me £9,000;' and he added, 'I have, besides, £3,000 more to pay.' He said further, what was very reasonable, that this was a heavy burden, that it was grievous

to be borne, that it put him to exceeding inconvenience, and, if the Parliament were dissolved, he could not afford to fight his county or his borough, as the case might be, but would be obliged to retire from the field, and leave the contest, if there should be a contest, to some one else. You will believe, then, that the Government were greatly pressed by this consideration; and this consideration, added, it may be, to others, induced them to resign office rather than to dissolve Parliament. Thus you have a proof that whereas general corruption and putridity are the destruction of most bodies which they affect, the corruption of the present Parliament was, and is, the cause of its present existence."—*"Speeches," edited by Professor Rogers.*

Samples of the Sack.—Mr. Bright, in addressing a meeting at Birmingham in 1866, said: "Have you read the report of the proceedings at the Commission for Yarmouth? Did you read that a late member for that borough is said to have spent £70,000 to maintain his seat? Did you read that one gentleman, an inferior partner in a brewery, contributed £4,000 for the election of his partner, and that another gentleman, knowing nothing of that borough, went down there and supplied £6,000 to fight a contest spread only over a few days? Remember that when Yarmouth or any other borough is thus brought before the public, it is only a sample of a very considerable sack." Yarmouth was disfranchised by the Reform Act of 1867.

"Legitimate" Election Expenses.—We had a paper laid upon our tables this morning, giving an account of the expenses of elections from "S" downwards. I take the first few large boroughs, and I will read the expenses. The expense of the election for Stafford is £5,400; Stoke-upon-Trent, £6,200; Sunderland, £5,000; and Westminster, £12,000. These are the aggregate expenses of all the candidates. I take them as they come, without picking and choosing. I will now call attention to two or three

counties. I will take the southern division of Derbyshire. The election cost £8,500, and this is the cheapest I shall read. The northern division of Durham cost £14,620 and the southern division £11,000. South Essex cost £10,000; West Kent cost £12,000; South Lancashire, £17,000; South Shropshire, £12,000; North Staffordshire, £14,000; North Warwickshire, £10,000; South Warwickshire, £13,000; North Wiltshire, £13,000; South Wiltshire, £12,000; and the North Riding of Yorkshire, £27,000—all legitimate expenses, but by no means the whole expense. Now, I ask the House how it is possible that the institutions of this country can endure, if this kind of thing is to go on and increase?—*Mr. Lowe on the Reform Bill, May 31st,* 1866.

Sale of Boroughs.—I have seen an advertisement, before Grampound was disfranchised, offering a borough for sale (Westbury), as not only to be sold, but to be sold by order of the Court of Chancery. A short time before the Reform Bill, Lord Monson paid £100,000 for Gatton, which contained about twenty-five houses, and rather more than one hundred inhabitants. Mr. Aubrey, fellow-commoner of Trinity College, and nephew of Sir J. Aubrey, told me that his uncle, whose heir he was, thought that he could not spend £1,000 a year more pleasantly than in buying a borough and sitting in Parliament. He sat for Aldborough, in Yorkshire, by arrangement with its proprietor, Mr. De Crespigny, and on the understanding that he was to vote as he pleased. He did not pay £1,000 annually for the privilege, but calculated that it cost him that. £5,000 was the sum usually paid for a seat.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

An "Elegant Contingency."—Thomas Holcroft, the dramatist, was member of a political club called "The Society for Constitutional Information," and in 1794 was prosecuted for high treason, with other members of that body.

He drew up a paper in his own defence, in which he gave the following as an instance of the corrupt state of the parliamentary representation :—"The borough of Gatton, within these two years, was publicly advertised for sale by auction: not sold for a single parliament, but the fee simple of the borough, with the power of nominating the two representatives for ever. On the day of sale, the celebrated auctioneer scarcely noticed the value of the estate. The rental, the mansion, the views, the woods and waters, were unworthy regard, compared to what he called an *elegant contingency*. Yes, the right of nominating two members to Parliament, without the embarrassment of voters, was an elegant contingency! 'Need I tell you, gentlemen,' said he, glancing round the room with ineffable self-satisfaction, and exulting in what he called the jewel, the unique, which was under his hammer, 'Need I tell you, gentlemen, that this elegant contingency is the only infallible source of fortune, titles, and honours in this happy country? That it leads to the highest situations in the State? And that, meandering through the tempting sinuosities of ambition, the purchaser will find the margin strewed with roses, and his head quickly crowned with those precious garlands that flourish in full vigour round the fountain of honour? On this halcyon sea, if any gentleman who has made his fortune in either of the Indies chooses once more to embark, he may repose in perfect quiet. No hurricanes to dread; no tempestuous passions to allay; no tormenting claims of insolent electors to evade; no tinkers' wives to kiss; no impossible promises to make; none of the toilsome and not very clean paths of canvassing to drudge through; but, his mind at ease and his conscience clear, with this elegant contingency in his pocket, the honours of the State await his plucking, and with its emoluments his purse will overflow.'"—*Memoirs of Holcroft.*

Price of Votes.—Previously to the Reform Bill of 1832, pecuniary influence had operated upon the electors

of many boroughs to an extent scarcely now to be imagined. At Hull and Beverley, and probably at many other places, it was customary after the election to give four guineas for a single vote, or two for a divided one. At Hedon, a small borough and sea-port on the Humber, now disfranchised, it was usual to give twenty guineas for a single vote, and ten for a divided one. Before an election there was no actual promise made, but the voter would say on being canvassed, "You will do what is usual after the election, sir, I suppose?" and the candidate would reply in the affirmative. Many of the *poor* electors did not wait for an election, but borrowed of the member sums of money, for which they gave a promissory note. When an election came, ten or twenty guineas was receipted upon the note, the residue of which still gave the candidate a hold upon the elector for a future occasion. This was told to me by Mr. Chaytor, of Spennithorne, in Wensleydale, who long represented the borough. To show the extent to which corruption prevailed, I may mention that when the Reform Bill was spoken of to some electors in Stafford, they expressed their pleasure at it, and hoped that there would be introduced into it some plan for the better payment of poor voters! St. Alban's was on the Great North Road, which gave the town prosperity by its posting; and it was said of its inhabitants, when the great inn was given up, that they remarked, "We have nothing now left to sell but our votes."—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."* Oldfield, in his "Representative History," states that the freemen of the borough of Grampound had been known to boast of receiving three hundred guineas a man for their votes at one election. Respecting the general election of 1826, the *Times* of June 20th of that year has the following:—"During the election at Sudbury, four cabbages sold for £10, and a plate of gooseberries fetched £25; the sellers where these articles were so dear being voters. At Great Marlow, on the contrary, things were

cheap, and an elector during the election bought a sow and nine young pigs for a penny."

"Mister Most."—Lord Dundonald relates in his "Autobiography," that while canvassing the electors of Honiton one of these independents said to him, "You need not ask me, my lord, who I votes for; I always votes for Mr. Most."

A Visitor from the Moon.—When the borough of Wendover was in the possession of Earl Verney, the electors in general lived rent free on condition of giving their votes to his lordship's nominee. A remarkable circumstance happened in 1768, in connection with this mutual arrangement, which Oldfield describes in his "Representative History." In the year named, a Mr. Atkins had undertaken, by a *coup-de-main*, to carry the election against his lordship's interest; and quite unexpectedly, on the day of the election, Sir Robert Darling was proposed and returned by a considerable majority. The voters were punished for their treachery to their superior by being instantly ejected from their houses, and were obliged to take refuge in huts and tents for six months, when, upon a proper acknowledgment of their contrition, they were allowed to repossess their former dwellings. In 1784, his lordship being in straits, the voters retaliated upon him by engaging with two candidates against his lordship's interest and influence, for a sum of £6,000. This being settled, a gentleman was employed to go down, when he was met, according to previous appointment, by the electors at a mile from the town. The electors asked the stranger where he came from. He replied, "From the moon." They then asked, "What news from the moon?" He answered that he had brought from thence £6,000 to be distributed among them. The electors, being thus satisfied with the golden news from the moon, chose the candidates and received their reward.

The "Dancing Punch."—The *Annual Register* for 1775 says:—In the course of the evidence given before the

select committee appointed to try, and determine the Hindon election, the following circumstances came out. On a day previous to the election, a man, disguised in a fantastic female habit, went about the town to canvass for two of the candidates. This figure, which was called the Dancing Punch, called at the door of almost every elector, and gave each five or ten guineas; and sent for such as had not been canvassed at their own houses, to an inn in the town, and there distributed its favours in the same manner. Some others in the opposite interest attended in an outer apartment of the house where their friends sat in an inner room, and there obliged the electors to sign an acknowledgment for a certain sum of money, which being done, a paper containing ten or fifteen guineas was handed out to every elector through a hole in the door. Upon that and other evidence the committee resolved, That Richard Smith and Thomas Brand Hollis, Esqs., had been returned by notorious bribery: That the House be moved for leave to bring in a bill to disfranchise the borough of Hindon, in Wilts. These resolutions were confirmed by the House on the 24th of February, when it was also decided that no writ should be issued for one month. It appears, however, from Oldfield's "Representative History," that the disfranchising bill was not passed, and a new writ was ordered to be issued on the 8th of May, 1776.

A Refuge for the Destitute. — In the debate on the second reading of the Reform Bill of Lord Derby's Government in 1859, Mr. Bright thus alluded to the small boroughs which it was proposed to retain under the bill: "Putting the case in the smallest number of words, you say that they send men into Parliament who cannot get in anywhere else. These boroughs form, in point of fact, a refuge for the politically destitute; and all that I have heard in their favour is, that the persons who find shelter in them are what would be called 'deserving objects.' * * * There

was an election at Harwich the other day, and I remember a statement made at the time. It was said that Mr. Bagshaw —not now a member of this House—had discharged a drunken gardener. There were two free traders who had carried out their principles further than the law sanctioned, and were imprisoned for smuggling. A respectable parson of the parish, who had not been out of his room for two years, was brought down (by the aid of cordials, stimulants, and a sedan-chair) to the poll; and those four individuals influenced the result of the election."—"*Speeches*," *edited by Professor Rogers.*

The Nottingham Lambs.—In the year 1790, a fiercely contested election took place for Nottingham. On one of the polling days I, being at a window in the market-place, saw the people set ladders against the Exchange Hall, burst through the windows, and seize a depôt of constables' staves, which they cut into bludgeons and threw out to the people below. One of them was aimed at the head of Mr. Smith (one of the candidates), as he was leaving the hustings in the market-place, but he was saved by having on an exceedingly high-crowned hat, such as was then fashionable.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."* The professor's daughter adds in a note, "On July 12, 1865, about ten a.m., an attack was made by the Lambs on a committee-room of Morley and Paget (Nottingham), and it was completely gutted. One cannot here say, *Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis.*"

A Disreputable Representative.—In the pension-list of Charles II. this paragraph appeared—"Sir John Holmes, Sir Robert's brother, and member for Newton (Isle of Wight), a cowardly, baffled sea-captain, twice boxed and once whipped with a dog-whip, was chosen in the night without the head-officer of the town, and but one burgess present; yet voted this last election, and will be re-elected." —*Oldfield's "Representative History."*

Westminster Elections.—We may take election proceedings in Westminster as a sample of those in other large boroughs. Many interesting anecdotes respecting them are on record. "It is curious" (says Isaac D'Israeli) "to observe that the Westminster elections, in the fourth year of Charles's reign (1629), were exactly of the same turbulent character as those which we witness in our days. The duke (of Buckingham) had counted by his interest to bring in Sir Robert Pye. The contest was severe, but accompanied by some of those ludicrous electioneering scenes which still amuse the mob. Whenever Sir Robert Pye's party cried, 'A Pye! a Pye! a Pye!' the adverse party would cry, 'A pudding! a pudding! a pudding!' and others, 'A lie! a lie! a lie!' This Westminster election ended as we have seen some; they rejected all who had urged the payment of the loans; and, passing by such men as Sir Robert Cotton and their last representative, they fixed on a brewer and a grocer for the two members for Westminster."

Putting an End to the Poll.—The Parliament expired with the session that closed April 25th, 1741, and a general election consequently ensued. Westminster had hitherto been a Government borough, and the nominees of the minister had been returned as a matter of course. Sir Charles Wager, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord Sandon, a lord of the Treasury, were proposed to be re-elected, but some of the electors were resolved to recover their representation, and Admiral Vernon and Mr. Edwin were put in nomination. The contest, although severe, seemed likely to terminate in favour of the ministerial candidates, since on the fifth day of polling they had a considerable majority; but on that day the high bailiff, Mr. John Lever, through cowardice or folly, put an end to the poll. Seeing a mob advancing to the hustings, bearing banners inscribed with the watchwords of the Opposition,

he became alarmed either for his own safety or for the success of the Government candidates. He mounted upon a form within the hustings, called out that he apprehended a riot was intended, and, ordering his clerks to shut their poll-books, ran into the vestry with them. The crowd, enraged at this interference, attacked Lord Sandon, who narrowly escaped with his life. Cooke, in his "History of Party," quotes the particulars of the affair from a "Review of the Westminster Election," which he observes "is of course grossly exaggerated for party purposes." The writer goes on to state that the Guards were called out, and sixty or seventy of them marched to Covent Garden churchyard, with drums beating and their bayonets fixed upon the muzzles of their muskets; they then drew up, and their sergeant declared that they came to murder every man there, if they got orders. Several of the electors petitioned against the return of Sandon and Wager, whereupon, after an inquiry, the House ordered "That John Lever, Esq. (the high bailiff), Nathaniel Blackerby, George Howard, and Thomas Lediard, Esqs., justices, who ordered the soldiers to attend, be severally taken into the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms."

A Dirty House.—An election for the city of Westminster took place in 1751, when Lord Trentham was returned against Sir George Vandeport, his opponent. Serious outrages having been committed by a mob, one of the ringleaders—Mr. Crowle, an attorney—was summoned before the House of Commons. The delinquent was commanded to kneel, and was duly reprimanded by the Speaker. On rising he wiped his knees, and said he had never been in so dirty a house before.—*Oldfield's "History."*

A Westminster Election described by a Foreigner. —While I was in London, what is called "hanging day" arrived. There was also a parliamentary election. I could only see one of the two sights, and therefore naturally

preferred the latter, while I only heard tolling at a distance the death-bell of the sacrifice to justice. Mr. Fox is one of the two members for Westminster; one seat was vacant, and that vacancy was now to be filled. Sir Cecil Wray, whom Fox had before opposed to Lord Hood, was now publicly chosen. The election was held in Covent Garden, a large market-place, in the open air. In the area before the hustings immense multitudes of people were assembled, of whom the greatest part seemed to be of the lowest order. To this tumultuous crowd, however, the speakers often bowed very low, and always addressed them by the title of "gentlemen." The moment Sir Cecil Wray began to speak, this rude rabble became all as quiet as the raging sea after a storm—only every now and then rending the air with the parliamentary cry of "Hear him! hear him!" Even little boys clambered up and hung on the rails and on the lamp-posts; and, as if the speeches had been addressed to them, they also listened with the utmost attention, and they, too, testified their approbation of it by joining lustily in the three cheers, and waving their hats. At length, when it was nearly over, the people took it into their heads to hear Fox speak, and every one called out, "Fox! Fox!" I know not why, but I seemed to catch some of the spirit of the place and time, and so I also bawled "Fox! Fox!" and he was obliged to come forward and speak. When the whole was over, the rampant spirit of liberty, and the wild impatience of a genuine English mob, were exhibited in perfection. In a very few minutes the whole scaffolding, benches, and chairs, and everything else were completely destroyed, and the mat with which it had been covered torn into ten thousand long strips, or pieces, with which they encircled multitudes of people of all ranks. These they hurried along with them, and everything else that came in their way, as trophies of joy; and thus, in the midst of exultation and

triumph, they paraded through many of the most populous streets of London.—"*Travels in England in* 1782," *by C. P. Moritz, of Berlin.*

Ladies on Canvass.—At the general election which took place consequent on the dissolution of Parliament in 1784, Fox appealed again to his old constituents at Westminster; so did Sir Cecil Wray. The Government set up Lord Hood as their candidate. It soon appeared that Lord Hood would be at the head of the poll, and that the real contest would be between Fox and Wray. The voters came forward slowly, and the poll continued open from day to day and from week to week—that is, from the 1st of April to the 17th of May. During this time every nerve was strained on either side. Several ladies of rank and fashion stood forth as Fox's friends—at their head, Georgiana, the eldest daughter of Earl Spencer, and the wife, since 1774, of the fifth Duke of Devonshire. Of great beauty and unconquerable spirit, she tried all her powers of persuasion on the shopkeepers of Westminster.* Other ladies who could not rival her beauty might at least follow her example. Scarce a street or alley which they did not canvass in behalf of him whom they persisted in calling "the Man of the People," at the very moment when the popular voice was declaring everywhere against him. The Prince of Wales rode through the streets of Westminster wearing Fox's colours. Pitt writes to Wilberforce on the 8th of April, "Westminster goes on well, in spite of the Duchess of Devonshire and the other Women of the People."—*Earl Stanhope's "Life of Pitt."* Earl Russell observes, with respect to this election ("Life of Fox"): "The Duchess of Devonshire canvassed for Mr. Fox, and contributed greatly, by her charms, her activity,

* "Devon's kiss seduced a blacksmith's vote."
—*Bulwer's "St. Stephen's."*

and her zeal, to gain electors to his side. She was, in revenge, libelled in the grossest manner by the advocates of the Court candidates. * * *. At the end of the election there was an immense crowd collected for the chairing of Mr. Fox. He mounted a car; an immense procession followed, which was closed by the state-carriages of the Duchesses of Portland and Devonshire, drawn by six horses each. Mr. Fox descended from the car at Devonshire House, where the Prince of Wales and the Duke and Duchess of Devonshire were assembled on a temporary platform to receive him. He dined at Willis's Rooms, where he made a warm speech on the subject of the election. On the same day, the Prince of Wales, after attending the King at a review at Ascot, rode up St. James's Street in his uniform, and afterwards went to dine at Devonshire House, wearing Mr. Fox's colours and a laurel-branch for victory. On the following day more festivities took place. The Prince of Wales gave a grand breakfast, which lasted from noon till six o'clock in the evening."

Pauper Proxies.—I remember Canning's being very much amused when (having to deal with Knaresborough, then a close borough, in which the Duke of Devonshire's interest was paramount, and for which Mr. Tierney and Sir James Mackintosh were the members) he discovered the following sentence in a publication describing the borough: "The members never appear at the elections, and it is the constant practice to chair two old paupers by way of proxies." His merriment was unbounded at the idea of such grave old members of Parliament as Mr. Tierney and Sir James having those undignified representatives on these important occasions.—*Stapleton's "Canning and his Times."*

Caging the Voters.—I had to go to Kilkenny on the business of my own election (says Mr. John O'Connell,

in his "Parliamentary Experiences"), and while there some 120 or 130 Carlow freeholders were sent in to our especial care. It appeared that the landlord practice at the Carlow elections had been to "sweep the countryside" of the voters several days before the election, and lodge and keep them comfortably under watch and ward within the demesne walls of one or other of the candidates, and so secure them from being operated upon by agitation. Refusal to submit to this species of abduction was considered as high and grave an offence as refusal to vote according to the landlord's wish, and punished accordingly. The popular party at the election of 1841 retaliated this practice on the landlords. For three whole weeks, as I have said, we had 120 or 130 voters of the neighbouring county snugly quartered in an old brewery in the city of Kilkenny, fed most abundantly, entertained during the day with the music of the temperance bands of the city, and during the evening with political speechification—a strong and active watch of true Kilkenny boys being meanwhile maintained within and without, day and night, to prevent desertions and invasions. The feats of swallowing which some of these poor fellows accomplished during the two or three first days, while they were quite new to good feeding, and our commissariat was not sufficiently regulated, were wonderful. One poor fellow, over six feet in height and nearly five in the breadth of the shoulders—a bony, gaunt, lank-looking creature—made the following morning meal, greatly to the dismay of the caterer and contractor: Two plates of cold corned beef; two ditto of mutton; bread, butter, and cheese to no end; two bowls of coffee; three large bowls of tea; a bottle of soda-water; and finally, a glass of whisky! (this item was contraband.) On the day of nomination at Carlow we set out from Kilkenny with our "caged birds," to traverse the twenty-two Irish miles intervening between us and the scene of action. First came a stage-coach, loaded with the "agitators"—

Carlow and Kilkenny men intermixed; then one of Bianconi's long stage-cars, with a temperance band to enliven us on the road; then twenty jaunting-cars, with the voters, and a "guard" car bringing up the rear. On either side we had an escort of county Kilkenny farmers, on their stout hacks, to guard our convoy from any guerilla charges that the enemy might take it into their heads to make.

Disorderly Electors.—I recollect an election for the borough of Carlow. There were two troops of dragoons, two companies of infantry, and one hundred and fifty police; the whole of this force having, during the period of the election, been engaged in keeping the peace in a town which comprised only two hundred electors.—*Bright's "Speeches."*

A Preposterous Request.—The candidate for a county representation in the west of Ireland had asked a friend of his—a gentleman resident and well known (and I will add, greatly liked) in the part of the county which the candidate was going to visit—to accompany him on a ride to visit and canvass the farmer voters. They drew up their horses at the door of one farmhouse, where stood, in all the glory of his electoral privilege, a stout and sturdy yeoman, waiting to be wooed. The candidate, with all the deferential urbanity *de rigueur* on such occasions, raised his hat, and respectfully expressed his hope that he might have the honour of Mr. ——'s vote and support at the next election. "Oh, well, Mr. F., I am sure I respect you and your family, sir, very much; but before I promise my vote I'd like to hear, sir, what are your *prenciples*." Mr. F. was about to answer, as in duty and interest bound, and with undiminished urbanity, when his canvassing friend and *aide-de-camp* pulled him back, and, craning over the neck of his horse, opened a broadside on the astonished farmer. "His *principles!* Mr. F.'s principles! You ask a gentleman like Mr. F. his principles! Get 'along with you! A

pretty pass things are come to when Mr. F. must stop on the road to tell you his principles! Come away, F., pitch the fellow, and his vote, and his principles to the d—— together, and don't be losing your time." "Oh, my dear ——," said the candidate, as soon as he got breath again, after the double effects of laughter and the smart canter into which his indignant *aide-de-camp* had forced the horses, "you're an excellent fellow, and I am much obliged for your offer to assist me; but, unless you want me to lose my election, never more be canvasser of mine."—*John O'Connell's "Parliamentary Experiences."*

The Less Exceeding the Greater.—Amongst O'Connell's anecdotes was one of the son of a Wexford elector, whose father had been promised patronage by a member of the Loftus family, in return for a vote. The father's ambition aimed at a sergeantcy in the artillery. Lord Loftus, on applying for this post for the youth, was informed that it was totally impossible to grant his request, inasmuch as it required a previous service of six years to qualify a candidate for the sergeantcy. "Does it require six years' service to qualify him for a lieutenant?" demanded Lord Loftus. "Certainly not," was the answer. "Well, can't you make him a lieutenant, then?" rejoined his lordship. "Whereupon," said O'Connell, laughing heartily, "the fellow was made a lieutenant, for no better reason than just because he wasn't fit to be a sergeant."—*Daunt's "O'Connell."*

An "Intimidating" Visage.—During the Clare election in 1828, when Mr. Daniel O'Connell and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald were the candidates, an attorney employed by Mr. Fitzgerald rushed in and exclaimed that a priest was terrifying the voters. This accusation produced a powerful effect. The counsel for Mr. O'Connell defied the attorney to make out his charge. The assessor very properly required that the priest should attend; and behold Father Murphy, of Carofin! His solemn and spectral aspect struck

everybody. He advanced with fearlessness to the bar, behind which the sheriff was seated, and inquired what the charge was which had been preferred against him, with a smile of ghastly derision. "You were looking at my voters," cried the attorney. "But I said nothing," replied the priest; "and I suppose I may be permitted to look at my parishioners." "Not with such a face as that!" cried Mr. O'Doherty, one of Mr. Fitzgerald's counsel. This produced a loud laugh; for certainly the countenance of Father Murphy was fraught with no ordinary terrors. At this instant one of the agents of Mr. O'Connell precipitated himself into the room, and cried out, "Mr. Sheriff, we have no fair play; Mr. Singleton is frightening his tenants. He caught hold of one of them just now, and threatened vengeance against him." This accusation came admirably *apropos*. "What!" exclaimed the advocate of Mr. O'Connell, "is this to be endured? Do we live in a free country, and under a constitution? Is a landlord to commit a battery with impunity, and is a priest to be indicted for his physiognomy, and to be found guilty of a look?" Thus a valuable set-off against Father Murphy's eyebrows was obtained.—*Huish's "Memoir of O'Connell."*

Swearing an Irish Elector.—The following scene is described by Mr. John O'Connell, in his "Parliamentary Experiences," the actors being the sheriff's deputy, presiding in the polling-booth, his clerk, the voter, and occasionally one or other of the attorneys or election agents there stationed. Clerk: "Now, repeat the words after me. 'I, Patrick O'Shaughnessy ——'" Voter: "Yis, that's me." Deputy: "That won't do, voter; you must say exactly as the clerk says." Voter: "Yis, your honour; I will, sir." Clerk: "I, Patrick O'Shaughnessy, do swear ——" Voter: "Yis, I do." Clerk: "Come, come, you stupid fellow, repeat the words after me. 'I, Patrick O'Shaughnessy,'" &c. &c. Voter: "Well, anything for a quiet life. 'I, Patrick

O'Shaughnessy, do swear ——'" Clerk: "'That I am the same Patrick O'Shaughnessy whose name appears in this certificate.'" Voter: "'That I am—the same ——' Arrah! (indignantly) to be sure I am! Who else could I be? Is it wanting to make game of me you are?" Deputy: "Come, come, voter; I'll send you off the table if you don't do as you're bid, and not be wasting our time in this manner. Repeat after the clerk, sir, as you are told, or I won't take your vote at all." Voter: "Well, sure I will, sir—I will! This is a poor case, now. Well; 'that I am the same,' &c. &c. Will that plaze ye?" Clerk: "Silence, sir! 'And that I have not before voted at this election.'" Voter: "No! the divil a vote! Well, you know it yourself that I wasn't up here before to-day," &c. &c. Again, when the bribery oath is being put. Clerk: "'And that I have not received anything, nor has any one in trust for me.'" Voter: "No; the dickens a hap'orth; nor any one for me either! Troth, if it was a thing I was going to sell my conscience that way, it's little I'd thrust to another to resave the valley for me!" &c. &c. At length—at long last—the poor clerk gets him to the end of the oath, and the formula of kissing the book is gone through. This is the signal for a new difficulty. Up starts the opposing attorney, ripe and ready for a row, and protests that the man did not "kiss fair;" that he "kissed his thumb" instead of the book. At such an imputation upon his honesty and due regard for his oath, the indignation of the voter knows no bounds. "Kiss my thumb, indeed! Kiss your granny! Troth, then, if *you* only said yer prayers this fine mornin' as surely as I kissed the book, the ould boy below wouldn't have the howld of yer sowl that he has, Misther Attorney!" Here the sensitive professional appeals to the deputy for protection, amid the shouts of laughter of the people in the body of the court, while his learned brother at the other side jumps up, quite as smartly, to argue the matter with him. The deputy

storms; the police vainly shout for silence; and meantime the voter quietly slips away, perfectly satisfied with himself, since he had an opportunity of giving an answer to his assailant, and greatly rejoicing in the hubbub and confusion he has created.

EXCLUSION OF STRANGERS.

"Among the privileges of Parliament," says Sir Erskine May ("Constitutional History") "none had been more frequently exercised (down to 1782) by both Houses than the exclusion of strangers from their deliberations. Precautions were necessary to prevent confusion; for even so late as 1771 a stranger was counted in a division. When the debates in Parliament began to excite the interest of the public, and to attract an eager audience, the presence of strangers was connived at. They could be dismissed in a moment, at the instance of any member; but the Speaker was not often called upon to enforce the orders of the House." The following are some of the occasions on which this privilege has been exercised:—

The Unreported Parliament.—Mr. Wright, in his advertisement to "Cavendish's Debates," referring to the Parliament commonly known by the designation of the "Unreported Parliament," says: "Much regret has often been expressed that the proceedings of the House of Commons during the thirteenth Parliament of Great Britain, which met in May, 1768, and was dissolved in June, 1774, should, in consequence of the strict enforcement of the standing order for the exclusion of strangers from the gallery of the House, have remained nearly a blank in the history of the country." It was known that Sir Henry Cavendish had taken, in short-hand, an account of the debates during that period; and Mr. Wright succeeded in finding it

among the Egerton manuscripts. It consists of forty-nine small quarto volumes, and contains notes of all the principal debates which took place during the six sessions of the above-mentioned Parliament.

Mutual Exclusion of the Lords and the Commons.—On the 10th of December, 1770, the Duke of Manchester rose in the Lords to make a motion relative to preparations for the war with Spain, then believed to be impending, when he was interrupted by Lord Gower, who desired that the house might be cleared. The messengers were already proceeding to clear the house, when several members of the House of Commons, who had been waiting at the bar to bring up a bill, desired to stay for that purpose, but were turned out with the crowd—several peers having gone down to the bar to hasten their withdrawal. They were presently called in again; but the moment they had delivered their message, and before time had been allowed them to withdraw from the bar, an outcry arose, and they were literally hooted out of the house. Furious at their indecent treatment, the members hastened back to their own house. The first result of their anger was sufficiently ridiculous. Mr. George Onslow desired the house to be cleared, "peers and all." The only peers below the bar were the very lords who had in vain resisted the exclusion of strangers from their own house, which they had just left in indignation; and now the resentment of the Commons, provoked by others, was first expended upon them. * * * Lord Chatham happily expressed his contempt for a senate debating with closed doors. Writing to Colonel Barré, on the 22nd January, 1771, he says, "I take it for granted that the same declaration will be laid before the tapestry on Friday, which will be offered to the live figures in St. Stephen's;" and again on the 25th he writes to Lady Chatham, "Just returned from the tapestry." The mutual exclusion of the members of the two Houses

continued to be enforced in a spirit of vindictive retaliation for several years.—*May's "Constitutional History."*

Motion by Mr. John O'Connell.—The questions of privilege and the presence of strangers in the house were raised on the 18th May, 1849, by the member for Limerick, Mr. John O'Connell, who rose and spoke as follows, according to the report given in "Hansard":—"Mr. Speaker, I beg to give a notice upon a matter concerning the privileges of this House, connected with the last discussion upon the Parliamentary Oaths Bill. In consequence of having seen in the *Times* newspaper another breach of the privileges of this House, by a report of the last discussion upon the Parliamentary Oaths Bill, in which report not only were the rules of the House violated, but the arguments of some Catholic members were entirely omitted, whilst the arguments against them were duly reported, I shall to-night, when the discussion upon the Parliamentary Oaths Bill comes before the House, endeavour to ascertain if there be strangers present, and if I find that to be the case I shall draw the attention of the House to that fact." Later on the same night, when the House went into committee on the bill referred to, Mr. J. O'Connell, in pursuance of his notice, directed the attention of the chairman (Mr. Bernal) towards the Reporters' Gallery, and said, "Sir, I perceive that there are strangers in that gallery." The chairman having given the order, all strangers present were excluded.

Motion by Colonel Thompson to Alter the Rule.—In consequence of the exclusion of strangers by the honourable member for Limerick, Colonel Thompson, on the 24th May, moved "That this House will take into its consideration the rule or practice whereby strangers have been excluded on the motion of any single member, with a view to alter the same; so that a motion for the exclusion of strangers shall be made and seconded, and question thereupon be put, as is the practice with other motions."

The motion of the honourable and gallant member, after a brief discussion, was, however, negatived. Mr. J. O'Connell, on the 8th of June, again caused the galleries to be cleared of strangers. The circumstance is thus given in "Hansard":—The Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill was about to be considered in committee when Mr. O'Connell said: "Sir, after the specimen of fairness which I experienced when I was going to express my opinion on the Poor Law just before the last division, there is but one course left me,—either to insist on the House enforcing justice to its members, or by doing away with an absurd practice; and therefore, sir, I see strangers present" (waving his hat towards the Reporters' Gallery). Strangers were immediately ordered to withdraw.

Motion by Mr. Crawfurd.—On the 24th of April, 1870, Mr. W. Fowler, the member for Cambridge, asked leave to bring in a Bill for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Mr. Crawfurd, member for the Ayr Burghs, then called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that there were strangers in the house. The *Times* gives the following report of what took place thereupon:—"This unusual proceeding caused some commotion. Honourable members turned towards Mr. Crawfurd, inquiring whether he intended to insist on the point of order he had raised; others looked to the Speaker, awaiting his order to the officers to clear the galleries; and in this interval of suspense Mr. Bouverie rose and said, if the honourable member persisted in calling attention to the presence of strangers, they must be ordered to leave. The Speaker was understood to suggest that on reconsideration the honourable member might not wish to insist on excluding strangers. He then said, very slowly, 'Does the honourable member persist? Strangers must——' Several honourable members exclaimed 'Withdraw! withdraw!' Mr. Bouverie: 'There is no motion.' The Speaker: 'Does the honourable

member persist?' Mr. Crawfurd: 'I do, sir.' The Speaker: 'The galleries must be cleared.' The officers proceeded to clear the Speaker's and the Strangers' Galleries, and the reporters withdrew from their gallery." It is deserving of remark, and perhaps may be considered as a sort of apology to the reporters for their share in the general exclusion, that on re-entering their gallery they were greeted with a burst of cheering from the House. On the 20th of July, 1870, it is recorded in "Hansard," the debate on the Contagious Diseases Acts was resumed, and, as on the previous discussion, Mr. Crawfurd called the attention of the Speaker to the presence of strangers, whereupon they were ordered to withdraw.

Garrick Hiding himself in the Gallery.—In the spring of 1777, Garrick chanced to be present in the gallery of the House of Commons during a debate which produced an altercation between two members, that became so warm as to oblige the Speaker and the House to interpose to prevent a duel. Whilst the assembly was in this agitation, a Shropshire member observed Mr. Garrick sitting in the gallery, and immediately moved to clear the House. Roscius contrived to keep himself concealed, and avoided the consequence of the illiberal motion. But when the same gentleman, the day after, harangued the House on the impropriety of suffering players to hear the debates, Mr. Burke arose and appealed to the honourable assembly whether it could possibly be consistent with the rules of decency and liberality to exclude from the hearing of their debates a man to whom they were all obliged—one who was the great master of eloquence—in whose school they had all imbibed the art of speaking, and been taught the elements of rhetoric. For his part, he owned that he had been greatly indebted to his instructions. Much more he said in commendation of Mr. Garrick, and was warmly seconded by Mr. Fox and Mr. Thomas Townshend.—*Burke's "Life of Burke."*

An Intruder in the House.—During the session of 1642, one Mr. Shepherd, a stranger, came into the house, and stood behind the sergeant. So divers espied him out, and called him to the bar. There he would not tell his name, but said he was a Bedfordshire man. As divers knew him he was dismissed.—*Harl. MSS.*

A Stranger Counted in a Division.—A division took place in the House of Commons, February 11th, 1771, on the bill to repeal a clause of the Nullum Tempus Act, when it happened, says the "Parliamentary History," that among the members coming in on the division, a stranger, who had continued in the lobby after it was cleared, had come in and was told as one of the "noes." The stranger was brought to the bar, and, by general consent of the House, dismissed, with a caution from Mr. Speaker not to be guilty of the like offence again. It appears that the intruder was a merchant of Bermuda, named Hunt, and that he was personally known to several of the members.

The Strangers' Gallery.—The question of admitting the public to the Strangers' Gallery of the House of Commons without a member's order was raised, February 1st, 1837, by Mr. Ewart, who considered that the present system was a great injury to the unrepresented class. His proposition was opposed by Lord John Russell, on the ground that on all great occasions the gallery would be inconveniently crowded, and that pickpockets were likely to put in an appearance among the respectable visitors. A division gave the result of eleven for the opening, and one hundred and seventy-three against it.—*Hansard.*

The Peeresses' Galleries.—Waiting to Conquer.—The Peeresses' Galleries are set apart for the wives and unmarried daughters of peers; and if the daughter of a peer marries a commoner, she loses her privilege. Horace Walpole tells the story of the struggle of the peeresses for admission into the House of Lords, and their

ultimate triumph over every obstacle. They had been admitted, but made such a noise that orders were issued that their presence could no longer be tolerated. But they came again. The Lord Chancellor swore they should not enter, and a noble duchess, with equal warmth, swore they would. The doors were shut on them, and they tried what rapping would do; but, though this stopped the debate, it failed to open the doors. Then silence was called for half an hour, when the peers, confident that the enemy must be gone, and thirsting for fresh air, ordered the doors to be re-opened, and in rushed the victorious band.

PUBLICATION OF DEBATES.

Members Punished for Divulging Debates.—In the reign of Henry VII. (says Oldfield) a member of the House of Commons was committed to the Tower for acquainting the King with the debates in Parliament, and both he and his posterity were by an Act disabled for ever sitting or serving as a representative from any place whatever. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was a similar case, when Arthur Hall, Esq., was committed to the Tower for six months, fined five hundred pounds, and expelled the House, for having published the debates.

Note-taking Cannot be Stopped. — Sir Simonds D'Ewes relates that when the Clerk of the House was questioned as to who did sometimes write out of his journal-book, or were present, "he said Mr. Moore and Mr. Bodrell did often write out of the same, and that myself was sometimes present. But I, mistaking him and conceiving that he ranked me amongst the transcribers (who scarcely wrote three words out of his journal-book in three months), was very angry with him, and stood up and said that I was, indeed, often present when others transcribed out of the

said journal, but did myself write not out of that, but out of my head." A delicate matter coming under debate next day, some members arose in much excitement to suggest that the debate be adjourned for a day, and that no one meanwhile be permitted to take notes. "Stop note-taking!" cried D'Ewes, "you cannot; or, if you can, make men hold their tongues, then, as well!"—*Forster's "Arrest."*

Reporting in the Last Century.—The very imperfect manner in which accounts of parliamentary debates were communicated to the public in the last century, is thus described by Lord Brougham, in his sketch of the Earl of Chatham:—"At one period they were given under feigned names as if held in the Senate of Rome by the ancient orators and statesmen; at another they were conveyed under the initials only of the names borne by the real speakers. Even when, somewhat later, these disguises were thrown aside, the speeches were composed by persons who had not been present at the debates, but gleaned a few heads of each speaker's topics from some one who had heard him; and the fullest and most authentic of all those accounts are merely the meagre outline of the subjects touched upon, preserved in the diaries or correspondence of some contemporary politicians, and presenting not even an approximation to the execution of the orators. Thus many of Lord Chatham's earlier speeches in the House of Commons, as now preserved, were avowedly the composition of Dr. Johnson, whose measured style, formal periods, balanced antitheses, and total want of pure racy English, betray their author at every line, while each debater is made to speak exactly in the same manner. For some years after he ceased to report, or rather to manufacture—that is, from 1751 downwards—a Dr. Gordon furnished the newspapers with reports, consisting of much more accurate accounts of what had passed in debate, but without pretending to give more than the

substance of the several speeches. The debates upon the American Stamp Act, in 1764, are the first that can be said to have been preserved at all, through the happy accident of Lord Charlemont, assisted by Sir Robert Deane, taking an extraordinary interest in the subject, as bearing upon the grievances of Ireland; and accordingly they have handed down to us some notes, from internal evidence plainly authentic, of Lord Chatham's celebrated speeches upon that question. A few remains of his great displays in the House of Lords have in like manner been preserved, chiefly in the two speeches reported by Mr. Hugh Boyd; the second of which, the most celebrated of all, upon the employment of the Indians in the American war, there is reason to believe was revised and corrected by Lord Chatham himself, and if so, it was certainly the only one that ever underwent his reivsion."

DR. JOHNSON AND THE DEBATES.—The following facts are given in Boswell's "Life of Johnson":—In 1738 Johnson was enlisted by Cave as a regular coadjutor in the *Gentleman's Magazine.* What we certainly know to have been done by him was the debates in both Houses of Parliament under the name of "The Senate of Lilliput," sometimes with feigned denominations of the several speakers, sometimes with denominations formed of the letters of their real names, in the manner of what is called anagram, so that they may easily be deciphered. Parliament then kept the press in a kind of mysterious awe, which made it necessary to have recourse to such devices. * * * This important article of the *Gentleman's Magazine* was for several years executed by Mr. William Guthrie—a man who deserves to be recorded in the literary annals of this country. The debates in Parliament, which were brought home and digested by Guthrie—whose memory, though surpassed by others who have since followed him in the same department, was yet

very quick and tenacious—were sent by Cave to Johnson for his revision; and, after some time, when Guthrie had attained to greater variety of employment, and the speeches were more and more enriched by the accession of Johnson's genius, it was resolved that he should do the whole himself, from the scanty notes furnished by persons employed to attend in both Houses of Parliament. Sometimes, however, as he himself told me, he had nothing more communicated to him than the names of the several speakers, and the part which they had taken in the debate. Johnson told me that as soon as he found that the speeches were thought genuine, he determined that he would write no more of them, "for he would not be accessory to the propagation of falsehood." And such was the tenderness of his conscience that a short time before his death he expressed his regret for his having been the author of fictions which had passed for realities.

First Publication of Debates in the Irish Parliament.—It was in the time of Lord Chancellor Bowes, in the years 1763 and 1764, that the first printed reports of the speeches delivered in the Irish Parliament were published. They can hardly be considered very reliable, as they were given from the recollection of Sir James Caldwell, and few have memories so accurate as to recollect what falls from several speakers on the same, or on different subjects.—*O'Flanagan's "Lives of the Irish Chancellors."*

Fox on the Publication of Debates.—Soon after the meeting of Parliament in 1778, Colonel Luttrell, complaining that in a certain morning paper he had been grossly misrepresented, informed the House that, for his future safety and protection, he was determined to move that the standing order of the House for excluding strangers from the gallery should be strictly enforced. Mr. Fox laid down the true doctrine of publicity on this occasion. He said that "he was convinced the true and only method of

preventing misrepresentation was by throwing open the gallery, and making the debates and decisions of the House as public as possible. There was less danger of misrepresentation in a full company than in a thin one, as there would be a greater number of persons to give evidence against the misrepresentation. The shutting of the gallery could not prevent the proceedings of the House from finding their way to public view; for, during a certain period, when the gallery was kept empty, the debates were printed, let the manner of obtaining them be what it might; and, in fact, the public had a right to know what passed in Parliament."—*Earl Russell's "Life of Fox."*

Power of the Reporters.—On the subject of reporting, Lord Lyttelton, in a letter to the *Birmingham Post*, May 5, 1871, says: "I do not complain of the reporters. To do so would be unjust in my case—very foolish in any case; for we are absolutely at the mercy of those excellent and formidable personages, and to complain would make matters very much worse. I will tell two anecdotes. Mr. Cobbett, during the short time he was in Parliament, incessantly abused the reporters (whom he always called 'reporthers') for not fully reporting him. The consequence was that they ended by not reporting him at all. The late Lord Monteagle, when Mr. Spring Rice, in the House of Commons, once said something the reporters did not like. They sent him a formal warning that, unless he publicly apologised, reported he should not be. He did not apologise, and reported he was not for two years. At last the spell was broken by Mr. Murray, the bookseller, starting a new paper, called the *Constitution*. To ingratiate himself with Mr. Rice he reported his speeches, whereupon the others gave in."

The Fourth Estate.—In contrast to the restrictions imposed upon reports of debates in former times, the following may be noted. Macaulay writes, in 1828 ("Essay on

Hallam's History"), "The gallery in which the reporters sit has become a fourth estate of the realm." And in 1871 we find an ex-Prime Minister (Mr. Disraeli) alluding, in the House of Commons, to a newspaper as being "the classical authority" for reports of parliamentary proceedings.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Mace of the Commons.—There is a more intimate relation between the Speaker's mace and our legislative proceedings than most persons are aware of. Hatsell says: "When the mace lies *upon* the table, it is a House; when *under*, it is a Committee. When the mace is *out* of the House, no business can be done; when *from* the table and upon the Sergeant's shoulder, the Speaker alone manages."

The Speaker of the Lords.—It is singular that the president of this deliberative body is not necessarily a member. It has frequently happened that the Lord Keeper has officiated for years as Speaker, without having been raised to the peerage; and on the 22nd November, 1830, Mr. Brougham sat on the woolsack as Speaker, being at that time Lord Chancellor, although his creation as a peer had not yet been made out. The woolsack, indeed, is not strictly within the House, for the Lords may not speak from that part of the chamber, and if there on a division, their votes are not reckoned.—*Sir T. E. May's "Law, &c., of Parliament."*

"Another Place."—The rule that allusions to debates in the other House are out of order is mainly founded upon the understanding that the debates of the other House are not known, and that the House can take no notice of them. The rule has been so frequently enforced, that most members in both Houses have learned a dexterous mode of evading it by transparent ambiguities of

speech; and, although there are few orders more important than this for the conduct of debate, and for observing courtesy between the two Houses, none, perhaps, are more generally transgressed.—*Ibid.*

Petitions—Petitions to Parliament should be written upon parchment or paper, for a printed or lithographed petition will not be received; and at least one signature should be upon the same sheet or skin upon which the petition is written. It must be in the English language, or accompanied with a translation, which the member who presents it states to be correct; it must be free from interlineations or erasures; it must be signed; it must have original signatures or marks, and not copies from the original, nor signatures of agents on behalf of others; and it must not have letters, nor affidavits or other documents annexed. Petitions of corporations aggregate should be under their common seal. To these rules another may be added, that if the chairman of a public meeting signs a petition on behalf of those assembled, it is only received as the petition of the individual, and is so entered on the journals, because the signature of one party for others cannot be recognised. * * * By a resolution of the House of Commons, 2nd June, 1774, it was declared, "That it is highly unwarrantable, and a breach of the privileges of this House, for any person to set the name of any other person to any petition to be presented to this House."—*Ibid.*

Presenting Public Petitions.—"Ex Luce Lucellum."—On the 24th of April, 1871, a large procession of match-makers resident in the East-end of London was dispersed by the police while on its way to Westminster Hall. The object of the assemblage was to present a petition to the House of Commons against the proposed tax of one halfpenny upon each box of matches, announced by Mr. Lowe, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in submitting his budget for the year. Several questions were,

in consequence, put to the Home Secretary (Mr. Bruce) by various members on the 28th, relative to the grounds on which the purpose of the petitioners had been interfered with and prevented by the police authorities. The Home Secretary, in reply, stated "that such a procession was contrary to law—the law being that no large bodies of persons should go either to the Sovereign or to Parliament for the purpose of presenting a petition. The number permitted by law does not exceed ten persons. The Act of George III., known as the One Mile Act, applies to meetings, and provides that such meetings as that of Monday last shall not be held within one mile of Westminster." The tax referred to was to have been collected by means of a stamp affixed to each box of matches. *Ex luce lucellum*—"out of light a little profit"—was the motto devised by Mr. Lowe for the labels connected with this new impost. The Committee, however, refused its sanction to that mode of increasing the revenue. The Chancellor had imported the idea from the United States, where a similar tax produces a considerable amount annually.

Prevention of Crowds at Westminster Hall.—To facilitate the attendance of members without interruption, both Houses order, at the commencement of each session, "That the Commissioners of the Police of the metropolis do take care that, during the session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to the House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of the Lords (or Members) to and from this House; and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament; and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod (or the Sergeant-at-Arms attending this House) do communicate this order to the commissioners aforesaid.—*Sir T. E. May's "Law, &c., of Parliament."*

Early Hours in Parliament.—The sittings were formerly held at an early hour in the morning, generally at eight o'clock, but often even at six or seven o'clock, and continued till eleven, the committee being appointed to sit in the afternoon. In the time of Charles II., nine o'clock was the usual hour for commencing public business, and four o'clock for disposing of it. At a later period, ten o'clock was the ordinary time of meeting; and the practice of nominally adjourning the House until that hour continued until 1806, though so early a meeting had long been discontinued. According to the present practice, no hour is named by the House for its next meeting, but it is announced in the "Votes" at what hour Mr. Speaker will take the chair. Occasionally the House has adjourned to a later hour than four, as on the opening of the Great Exhibition, 1st May, 1851, to six o'clock, and on the Naval Review at Spithead, 11th Aug., 1853, to ten o'clock at night.—*May's "Parliamentary Practice."*

Motion for Candles.—In the House of Commons an interruption was sometimes caused by moving that candles be brought in; but by a standing order of the 6th of February, 1717, it was ordered, "That when the House, or any committee of the whole House, shall be sitting, and day light be shut in, the Sergeant-at-Arms attending this House do take care that candles be brought in, without any particular order for that purpose."—*May's "Constitutional History."*

Fines on Absent Members.—A correspondent putting a question on this subject to *Notes and Queries*, the editor replied as follows:—"The personal service of every member of the Commons House has been compulsory from time immemorial. By 5 Rich. II. c. 14 it is enacted, that 'if any person summoned to Parliament do absent himself, and come not at the said summons (except he may reasonably and honestly excuse himself to our Lord the King), he shall be amerced, or otherwise punished, according

as of old times hath been used to be done, within the said realm in the said case.' And by 6th Henry VIII. c. 16 it is declared that no member shall absent himself 'without the license of the Speaker and the Commons.' The penalties imposed upon members so offending have varied with the times and the temper of the House. Sometimes absentees have been committed to prison, but more frequently punished by fines, or the forfeiture of their 'wages.' In the latter Parliaments of Charles I. and those of the Commonwealth, the fine for disobeying a call of the House was not less than ten nor more than twenty pounds; and most probably the last-mentioned sum was the maximum in all times. Taking the value of money into consideration, as well as the loss of the parliamentary allowance, the cost of absenteeism at the period referred to certainly was not to be 'lightlie esteemed.' The infliction of fines seems to have ceased towards the close of the seventeenth century. The power of inflicting them rested with the House; the Speaker, in virtue of his office, merely executed its orders."

Fines for Late Arrival.—Many efforts (says Mr. Forster, in his "Arrest of the Five Members") had been made to compel early and full attendance at the House. Under the form of fines for being late at prayers these attempts were frequently renewed. The practice originated at the memorable time of May, 1641; but, owing to the confusion caused by the calls of "Pay! Pay!" which greeted dilatory members on their entrance, it was for the time abandoned. Ten months later it was renewed. On a Tuesday the fine was proposed. "A motion made," says D'Ewes, "as I came in, that such members as should not come up by eight, and be at prayers, should pay a shilling. I said, when that was tried twelve months ago it was laid aside from its inconvenience, after one day's practice; and that the best way would be to rise at twelve, and not at two or three, to ensure members coming at eight. Divers others

spake against it; but the greater number being for it, it passed." Very little, however, as it would seem, to the edification of Mr. Speaker, seeing that next morning (Wednesday) he did not make his appearance till a quarter to nine. "The House by this time," D'Ewes remarks, "was very full at prayers, by reason of the order made yesterday. Sir H. Mildmay, after prayers, stood up and said he was glad to see this good effect of yesterday's order, and said to the Speaker that he did hope that hereafter he would come in time; which made the Speaker throw down twelvepence upon the table. Divers spake after him, and others as they came in did each pay his shilling to the sergeant. I spake to the orders of the House: That the order made yesterday was to fine 'after' prayers, and therefore you (I spake to the Speaker) cannot be subject to pay; and for coming a little after eight, that was no great difference. Although I spake truly, the Speaker, having cast down his shilling, would not take it up again."

Non-attendance of Members.—In debates of the highest consequence during the reign of Charles I. (says Clarendon) there were not usually present in the House of Commons the fifth part of their just numbers, and very often not above a dozen or thirteen in the House of Peers.

A Groom of the Bedchamber Censured.—The late Lord Southampton, then Colonel Fitzroy, being in attendance upon the King's person, as one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber, and coming in late to make one of the forty members, the Speaker, Mr. Onslow, reprimanded him, as he came up the House, for not coming earlier. Colonel Fitzroy excused himself by saying "he was in waiting upon his Majesty." "Sir," said Mr. Onslow, with a loud and commanding voice, "don't tell me of waiting; this is your place to attend in; this is your first duty."—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

The "Right to be Heard."—It is reported of Sir

Spencer Compton that, when he was Speaker, he used to answer to a member who called upon him to make the House quiet, for that he had a right to be heard: "No, sir; you have a right to speak, but the House have a right to judge whether they will hear you." In this the Speaker certainly erred; the member has a right to speak, and it is the Speaker's duty for that purpose to endeavour to keep them quiet.—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

A Member Counting Himself Out.—About a score of our representatives were giving serious attention to a very serious address on a very important subject, by a very serious brother member. Vexed by the scanty attendance that listened to him, he joked about the crowded benches, the packed house, that he pretended to see around. The jest was fatal; he had referred to the number present. "Order! order!" from the chair silenced the debater. Amazed he sat down, quite ignorant of the effect of his wit. Then the Speaker, in due custom, began the regular, "One, two, three ——." Soon all was over; the two minutes elapsed; but twenty heads were counted, and the House broke, much in laughter at the luckless orator, who had counted himself out.—*"The House of Commons," by R. F. D. Palgrave.*

A Miscount.—A division took place in the House of Commons, May 17th, 1871, on the second reading of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, moved by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, when the numbers were declared to be, for the second reading, 124; against, 206—82. The tellers for the "ayes" on this occasion were Sir W. Lawson and Lord C. Hamilton; for the "noes," Mr. W. Wheelhouse and Mr. R. P. Amphlett. On the following day, as appears from the *Times* report, Sir W. Lawson, addressing the Speaker, said: "Yesterday, when the division took place on the second reading of the Permissive Bill, the honourable member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) gave in the numbers of the majority as 206, whereas it appears from the votes

that only 196 members voted against the bill." At a later period of the sitting, Lord C. Hamilton (who stood before the table with Mr. Wheelhouse, addressing the Speaker) said, he wished to state that the number of "noes" in the division was erroneously announced to be 206 instead of 196—the latter being the number which corresponded with the division list.

Alone in the Lobby.—It is said that Mr. Fawcett, one of the representatives for Brighton, is the only member who ever appeared by himself in a division lobby. The occasion on which this happened was the motion for a grant of £30,000 for the marriage portion of the Princess Louise, February 16th, 1871. When the committee divided, the "ayes" were 350 against one "no:" the "no" was Mr. Fawcett, who had for his tellers Mr. Taylor and Sir C. Dilke.

The Voice Overrides the Vote.—On the report of the Holyrood Park Bill, August 10th, 1843, a member called out with the "noes," "The noes have it," and thus forced that party to a division, although he was about to vote with the "ayes," and went out into the lobby with them. On his return, and before the numbers were declared by the tellers, Mr. Brotherton addressed the Speaker, and claimed that the member's vote should be reckoned with the "noes." The Speaker put it to the member whether he had said "The noes have it;" to which he replied that he had, but without any intention of voting with the noes. The Speaker, however, would not admit of his excuse, but ordered that his vote should be counted with the noes, as he had declared himself with them in the House.—*Sir T. E. May's "Law, &c., of Parliament."*

Attacking the Speaker.—A debate took place in the House of Commons, May 9th, 1777, on a motion made by Sir James Lowther for an increase of income to the royal dukes. After the debate the Speaker (Norton) complained

of an attack made upon him by one of the members (Rigby), and Charles Fox proposed words in justification of the Speaker, which were agreed to without a division. Lord North was exceedingly alarmed during the debate, and wrote several notes to Rigby across the House, to beg him to submit, which though he did, and asked pardon, the Speaker was stout, and declared he would resign the chair next day unless the House itself gave him satisfaction.—*Walpole's "Journals."*

A Quarrel with the Speaker.—Horace Walpole, in "Short Notes of my Life," prefixed to the edition of his "Letters" edited by Cunningham, relates that on the discussion of a measure in the House of Commons in 1747, to transfer the assizes from Aylesbury to Buckingham, he had a remarkable quarrel with the Speaker, Mr. Onslow. "The bill," he says, "was returned from the Lords with amendments. The friends of the Chief Justice resolved to oppose it again. Mr. Potter desired me to second him. He rose, but entering on the merits of the bill, Mr. T. Townshend and my uncle, Horace Walpole (to prevent me) insisted that nothing could be spoken to but the amendments. The Speaker supporting this, I said, 'I had intended to second Mr. Potter, but should submit to his *oracular* decision, though I would not to the complaisant peevishness of anybody else.' The Speaker was in a great rage, and complained to the House. I said, 'I begged his pardon, but had not thought that submitting to him was the way to offend him.'"

An Odious Comparison.—A debate took place in the House of Commons, December 12th, 1770, on a motion for deferring the Land Tax until after the Christmas recess, "when," says the *Public Advertiser*, "the riot which had recently taken place in the House of Lords* so shocked the

* See page 345.

delicacy of Sir Fletcher Norton, the Speaker, that upon occasion of some clamour this day he called to the members, with all the softness of a bassoon, 'Pray, gentlemen, be orderly; you are almost as bad as the other House.'"

Mutual Forbearance in Debate.—"We have great reason," said Sir William Coventry (1676), "in cases of disputes in Parliament, to give grains of allowance to one another. In ancient times but a few persons spoke in the House, and their speeches were ready penned. The powder and shot was ready made up in cartridges, ready cut and dried, and a man had then time to think; but now we speak on a sudden, and therefore would have some grains of allowance given."—*Parliamentary History.*

Abusive Language in Parliament.—Boswell writes (1784): "I censured the coarse invectives which were become fashionable in the House of Commons, and said that if members of Parliament must attack each other personally in the heat of debate, it should be done more genteelly. Johnson: 'No, sir; that would be much worse. Abuse is not so dangerous when there is no vehicle of wit or delicacy—no subtle conveyance. The difference between coarse and refined abuse is as the difference between being bruised by a club, and wounded by a poisoned arrow.'"

Use of a Conscience.—Hollis one day, upon a very hot debate in the House (1647), and some rude expressions which fell from Ireton, persuaded him to walk out of the House with him, and then told him that he should presently go over the water and fight with him. Ireton told him his conscience would not suffer him to fight a duel; upon which Hollis, in choler, pulled him by the nose; telling him, if his conscience would keep him from giving men satisfaction, it should keep him from provoking them.—*Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion."*

Vulgar Language in High Places.—I was sitting by

Lord Althorp (writes Earl Russell) when he announced, in his own homely way, his resolution to resign. "The pig's killed," he said. A porcine illustration was not new in our history. When Henry VIII. was considering of the best means of procuring his divorce from Catherine of Aragon, he gave his decision in favour of Cranmer's opinion by saying, "Cranmer has got the right sow by the ear." When Sir Robert Walpole was asked how he had overcome Sir Spencer Compton, to whom the King was partial, he replied, "He got the wrong sow by the ear, and I the right." So vulgar and idiomatic are the phrases of English monarchs and ministers.—*Introduction to "Speeches."*

Old Women.—The debates on the Swiss Regiment Bill occupied the House of Commons in the month of February, 1756. "Old Horace Walpole terminated this tedious affair with the lowest buffoonery, telling a long story of an old man and his wife; that the husband said to her, 'Goody Barrington, for that was her name—I must not falsify my story; if it had been Onslow I must have said it,' continued he, addressing himself to the Speaker; who replied very properly, 'Sir, one old woman may make as free as she pleases with another.'"—*Walpole's "Memoirs of George II."*

Freedom from Arrest.—In the thirty-fourth year of the reign of Henry VIII. (1543) George Ferrers, Esq., member for Plymouth, was arrested for debt and committed to prison, under the orders of the judges of the King's Bench. The House, on receiving information of the fact, sent their sergeant to demand their member. In the execution of his orders he met with resistance, his mace was broken, and his assistant knocked down. In consequence, the Sheriff of London and those who were concerned in the arrests were brought before the House, when some of them were committed to the Tower, others to Newgate, where they remained until they were discharged on the

petition of the Lord Mayor.—*Oldfield's "History of the House of Commons."*

Protection of Servants.—On the 8th of February, 1620, a complaint was made in the Commons that two of the members' pages had been punished for misbehaviour in the Court of King's Bench. It was stated, however, that the judges had sent one of the offenders to be punished by the House, and would send the other when he could be found; "and yet, but for respect for this House, they would have indicted them for stroke in face of the court; and many for less offences have lost their hands."—*Sir T. E. May's "Constitutional History."*

Arresting the Servant of a Member.—On the 4th of June, 1621, the House is informed of Johnson, Sir James Whitlock's man, being arrested. The parties are immediately called to the bar, and heard on their knees in their defence; and after a variety of propositions for various degrees of punishment, it is ordered, upon the question, "That they shall both ride upon one horse, bare-backed, back to back, from Westminster to the Exchange, with papers on their breasts with this inscription, 'For arresting a servant to a member of the Commons House of Parliament;' and this to be done presently, *sedente Curiâ.*"—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

Abusing Freedom of Speech.—In 1621, a Mr. Edward Floyde was punished by the House of Commons for a breach of privilege, in having scoffed at the son-in-law and daughter of the King (James I.). The sentence is thus reported:—1. Not to bear arms as a gentleman, nor be a competent witness in any court of justice. 2. To ride with his face to a horse's tail, to stand in the pillory, and have his ears nailed, &c. 3. To be whipped at the cart's tail. 4. To be fined £5,000. 5. To be perpetually imprisoned in Newgate. It was put to the question, first, whether Floyde should be whipped or not, because he was a gentle-

man; yet it was agreed, *per plures*, that he should be whipped. Then it was put to the question whether Floyde's ears should be nailed to the pillory or not, and agreed, *per plures*, not to be nailed.—*Thoms' "Book of the Court."*

Barrington's Expulsion from the House.—On February 15th, 1723, the House, having concluded its consideration of the report on the Harburgh Lottery, resolved, "That it appears to this House that John Lord Viscount Barrington in the kingdom of Ireland, a member of this House, has been notoriously guilty of promoting, abetting, and carrying on the fraudulent undertaking called the Harburgh Lottery, and that for his offence he be expelled this House." The noble lord, in his own justification, had previously assured the House "That his design was honest and disinterested; that he had nothing in view but the good of the nation; that the Company, if duly managed, might have been very advantageous to navigation and trade; and the object of the lottery was solely to enable the Company to carry on their trade."—*Parliamentary History.*

The Privilege of Franking Letters.—This was first proposed when a Post-office Bill was before Parliament in 1660. The "Parliamentary History" says:—"Sir Walter Earle delivered a proviso, for the letters of all members of Parliament to go free during their sitting. Sir Heneage Finch said 'it was a poor, mendicant proviso, and below the honour of the House.' Mr. Prynn spoke also against the proviso; Mr. Bunckley, Mr. Boscawen, Sir George Downing, and Serjeant Charlton, for it—the latter saying the counsels' letters were free. The question being called for, the Speaker, Sir Harbottle Grimstone, was unwilling to put it, saying he was ashamed of it; nevertheless the proviso was carried, and made part of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed. The Lords subsequently disagreed to this proviso, and it was ultimately thrown out. At a subsequent period,

however, both Houses did not feel it to be below their honour to secure for themselves this exemption from postage."

To Court in Top-boots.—When the resolution for an address to the King to make peace with America, in 1782, was carried by the Opposition, by a very small majority, it was decided that the address be taken up to the Throne by the whole House. In order to mark their sense of the treatment they had been receiving from the Court, the county members went up to the Throne, according to their privilege, in leather breeches and top-boots, instead of court dress—a privilege, of course, very seldom exercised. The Court was not behindhand with them; for, as a marked and well-understood insult to the Opposition, General Arnold (just returned from America) was placed conspicuously on the King's right hand, where he was visible to the whole body of the members.—*Professor Pryme's "Recollections."*

Correct Costume.—The mover and seconder of the address in answer to the King's speech always appeared in court dress, but the rest stood in a semicircle before the Throne, in their ordinary morning dress. On the presentation of the address in 1835, one honourable member chose to appear in court dress, and seeing himself, when we were assembled previously, differently habited from the others, inquired if he were correct; to which the Speaker (Abercomby) answered, "*Singularly* correct, sir."—*Ibid.*

"Tottenham in his Boots."—A very trifling circumstance marks the exactness and gravity of dress at that time (1730) insisted on in the Irish House of Commons. Colonel Tottenham was called "Tottenham in his Boots;" because, having just come to town, and hearing of the important business then under discussion, he hurried down to the House without giving himself time to take his boots off. The members stared; and the older ones, as I have been well assured, muttered sadly and loudly at this crying

innovation, as they termed it.—*Hardy's "Memoirs of the Earl of Charlemont."*

Penurious Peers.—In the Parliament which assembled at Drogheda, Dec. 1, 1494, the Lords spiritual and temporal were enjoined to appear in every Parliament in their robes, as the Lords of England. The reason assigned for this was "that during the space of twenty years the English lords of Ireland had, through penuriousness, done away the said robes, to their own great dishonour, and the rebuke of all the whole land."—*O'Flanagan's "Lives of the Irish Chancellors."*

Political Duelling Clubs.—A singular story is told by Sir Jonah Barrington, of the duelling clubs proposed respectively by the Unionists and their opponents, during the debates in the Irish Parliament in 1799, on the question of the Union with England. It is thus related in the "Life of Lord Plunket":—Sir Jonah describes a dinner given by Lord Castlereagh, at his house in Merrion Street, at which were entertained above eighty of his most staunch friends, consisting of "tried men," and men of "fighting families," who might feel an individual pride in resenting every personality of the Opposition, and in identifying their own honour with that of the Government. When the wine had been sufficiently circulated, the great question of the evening was skilfully introduced by Sir John Blaquiere (since Lord Blaquiere), who of all men was best calculated to promote a gentlemanly, convivial, fighting conspiracy. Having sent round many loyal, mingled with joyous and exhilarating toasts, he stated that he understood the Opposition were disposed to personal unkindness, or even incivilities, towards his Majesty's best friends—the Unionists of Ireland. He was determined that no man should advance upon him, by degrading the party he had adopted and the measure he was pledged to support. A full bumper proved his sincerity; the subject was discussed with great glee, and some of

the company began to feel zeal for "active service." It was also proposed, before they broke up, that there should be a dinner for twenty or thirty every day in one of the committee chambers, where they could be always at hand to make up a House, or for any *emergency* which should call for an unexpected reinforcement during any part of the discussion. The novel idea of such a detachment of legislators was considered whimsical and humorous, and, of course, was not rejected. * * * After much wit, and many flashes of convivial bravery, the meeting separated after midnight, fully resolved to eat, drink, speak, and fight for Lord Castlereagh. They so far kept their words that the supporters of Union indisputably showed more personal spirit than their opponents during the session. Sir Jonah professes to have had this story on the morning after the dinner, from one of the company, and he goes on to describe the opposition meeting which was held at Charlemont House on the following day. He assures us that when the plan reported to have been resolved on by the Castle party was explained, it was hotly contended by some that the partisans of Government should be taken at their words, and that the measure of the legislative Union should be submitted to the ordeal of battle, and discussed, not in speeches in the Parliament House, but with pistols in the "fifteen acres"—a name given to a portion of the Phœnix Park, near Dublin, a favourite resort of duellists.

A Challenge in the Peers.—In November, 1780, an affair of honour was brought before the House of Lords by the Chancellor, Thurlow, as a breach of privilege. The Earl of Pomfret, erroneously supposing that a gamekeeper whom he had discharged had been countenanced by the Duke of Grafton, wrote some very intemperate letters to his grace, and insisted on fighting him, either with sword or pistol. Thurlow, on the rumour of what had happened, moved that they should attend in their places in the House;

and both parties being heard, it was resolved that the behaviour of the Duke of Grafton had been highly laudable and meritorious; and Lord Pomfret, being made to kneel at the bar, was informed that he had been guilty of "a high contempt of the House."—*Campbell's "Lives."*

Duel between Lord George Germain and Governor Johnstone.—On December 14th, 1770, Lord George Germain moved, in the House of Commons, "That the Speaker do write to such eldest sons and heirs apparent of peers, King's serjeants, and masters in Chancery, as are members of this House, and to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, and to request them to attend in their places every day, at two of the clock, and to assist in carrying bills to the Lords." The honour of the nation, he said, was concerned in this. Governor Johnstone wondered that the noble lord should interest himself so deeply in the honour of the nation, when he had been hitherto so regardless of his own. These words occasioned a duel, the particulars of which are given in the "Parliamentary History." On the 17th, while Governor Johnstone was attending a committee, he received a message from Lord George, when it was arranged that they should meet in the Ring, in Hyde Park, an hour afterwards—the weapons to be pistols, as the Governor was suffering from a wound in his arm. The antagonists having prepared their pistols, Lord George called on the governor to fire, which the governor refused, saying that as his lordship brought him there, he must fire first. Shots were then exchanged, neither of which took effect. Lord George then fired his second pistol, and as he was taking down his arm, the governor's second ball hit his lordship's pistol, broke some part of it, and one of the splinters grazed his lordship's hand. The seconds immediately interposed, and the affair was ended.

Swearing the Peace against a Member.—There is a humorous story told of a member of the Irish Parliament,

who regularly commenced the session by swearing the peace against General A——. The friendly magistrate before whom this was usually done having died, a stranger succeeded, who, after the ceremony had been gone through as usual, thought it only equal justice to bind over the civilian also. "Sir, I have no bail here," observed the latter. "Oh! don't lock him up," said the general; "I'll be his bail that he'll never break the peace to myself or any other of his Majesty's subjects."—*Curran and his Contemporaries.*

Exclusion of Scotch Judges from the Commons.—I knew Mr. Erskine, my Lord Marr's brother; he was one of the judges in Scotland. However, he was by no means satisfied with this office, and determined to get a seat in the House of Commons, though to effect this he was previously obliged to resign his judgeship. For the Duke of Argyle, as soon as he was informed that my Lord Grange (Erskine's official title) had taken his measures so well as to be sure of being elected into Parliament, brought a bill into the House of Lords, which easily passed both Houses, to disqualify any judge of Scotland to sit in the House of Commons.—*Dr. King's "Anecdotes."*

The House of Commons Denounced by one of its Members.—When Alderman Oliver was sent to the Tower by the House of Commons in 1771, some of the members strongly disapproved of the course taken by the majority. Horace Walpole writes: "Sir George Savile left the House, protesting against their proceedings, and was followed by some of his friends. Colonel Barré went farther—said in his place that the conduct of the House was *infamous*, that no honest man could sit amongst them, and walked away—and the House was forced to swallow so ungrateful a bolus."

The Rush to Dinner.—As it has been with many a modern Mr. Speaker between the hours of seven and eight in the evening, so fared it with Mr. Speaker Lenthal,

between twelve and one mid-day. One day the rush of members out of the house at that hour, during a debate on supply, had been such that he was fain flatly to tell them "they were unworthy to sit in this great and wise assembly in a parliament that would so run forth for their dinners."—*Forster's "Grand Remonstrance."*

The "Dinner-bell" of the House.—I am indebted to a friend (says Professor Pryme) for the following: "An anecdote is told of David Hartley, the dinner-bell of the House, getting up to speak. Sir Robert Walpole took the opportunity of taking his ride, and went home, changed his dress for riding costume, rode to Hampstead, returned, put on full dress and came down to the House, when he found D. Hartley still on his legs, not having finished his speech."—*Pryme's "Recollections."*

Consequences of Naming a Member.—A story used to be told of Mr. Speaker Onslow, which those who ridiculed his strict observance of forms were fond of repeating: that he often, upon a member's not attending to him, but persisting in any disorder, threatened to name him: "Sir, sir, I must name you." On being asked what would be the consequence of putting that threat into execution, and naming a member, he answered, "The Lord in heaven knows!"—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

Sunday Observance Bills.—February 15th, 1621, a member, Mr. Shepard, is discharged from the House, for his speech on the Bill for Keeping the Sabbath, otherwise called Sunday. "The House doth remove him from the service of this House, as unworthy to be a member thereof." Objections are taken to the term "Sabbath," Dies Sabbati being Saturday, and Sunday being used in all statutes. Sir George Moore said, "In every Parliament I have served have been bills for observing the Sabbath."—*Parry's "Parliaments of England."*

Fighting and Fasting.—On the 30th January, 1628,

both Houses joining in petitioning the King (Charles I.) for a fast, to seek reconciliation at the hands of Almighty God, for a happy success in the affairs of the Church and State, and for diverting the miseries of the Reformed Church abroad. The King answered that the deplorable condition of the Reformed Churches abroad is too true; and we ought to give them all possible help. But fighting would do them more good than fasting. This custom of fasting every session was but lately begun, and he was not satisfied with the necessity of it at this time; yet he willingly granted them their request, but it should not hereafter be brought into precedent, except upon great occasions.—*Rushworth's "Historical Collections."*

The Act for Licensing Plays.—In the course of the session 1737, Giffard (the manager of Goodman's Fields Theatre) brought to Sir Robert Walpole a farce called the "Golden Rump," which had been proposed for exhibition; "but it is uncertain," says Coxe in his "Life of Walpole," from whose narrative the following particulars are taken, "whether the intentions of the manager were to request his advice on this occasion, or to extort a sum of money to prevent its representation." The minister, however, paid the profits which might have accrued from the performance, and detained the copy. He then made extracts of the most exceptionable passages, abounding in profaneness, sedition, and blasphemy, which he read in the House. Leave was accordingly given to bring in a licensing bill, which was introduced on the 20th May, read the 24th, a second time on the 25th, and finally passed on the 1st of June. With equal dispatch the measure passed through its various stages in the Upper House, and received the royal assent on the 21st.

A Bed-ridden Law.—Old Sir Benjamin Rudyard in the Long Parliament said, "he should like to see that good, old, decrepit law, Magna Charta, which hath been kept so long

bed-rid, as it were, walk abroad again, with new vigour and lustre."—*Forster's "Civil Wars."*

Creating an Historian.—Lord Hyde was created Earl of Clarendon, and Lord Trevor Viscount Hampden. These peers had been connected with George Grenville, and were supposed to owe their promotions to Lord Suffolk, the patron of that connection. Lord Hyde was so dull a man that Lord John Cavendish said, with a sneer, "The ministers have made a rebellion (the outbreak in the American Colonies), and now they have made a Lord Clarendon to write the history of it."—*Walpole's "Journals"* (1776).

An Artist on a Canvass.—Dr. Doran, in a note to his edition of Walpole's "Journals," relates the following *mot* of George Selwyn's: A report was circulated to the effect that Sir Joshua Reynolds was to stand for Plympton, on the next occasion of an election. The maccaronies, club-men, and "gentlemen" generally, laughed at the idea of an artist, or of a literary man, presuming or having a chance to get into the House of Commons. "He is not to be laughed at, however," said Selwyn; "he may very well succeed in being elected, for Sir Joshua is the ablest man I know on a canvas."

The Honour of a Seat.—In reference to his friend Mr. Thrale's seeking a seat in Parliament, Dr. Johnson said: "It would be with great discontent that I should see Mr. Thrale decline the representation of the borough. To sit in Parliament for Southwark is the highest honour that his station permits him to attain; and his ambition to attain it is rational and laudable. I will not say that for an honest man to struggle for a vote in the legislature, at a time when honest votes are so much wanted, is absolutely a duty; but it is surely an act of virtue. The expense, if it were more, I should wish him to despise. Money is made for such purposes as this."—*Mrs. Piozzi's "Anecdotes."*

Southey Vacating his Seat.—A singular method of vacating a seat was that of Mr. Southey in 1826, who had been elected for Downton, during his absence on the Continent. His return was not questioned, but he addressed a letter to the Speaker, in which he stated he had not the qualification of estate required by law. The House waited until after the expiration of the time limited for presenting election petitions, and then issued a new writ for the borough.—*May's "Law, &c., of Parliament."*

Members and the Mob.—Mr. Bramston, the son of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, relates what he saw on the 27th December, 1641, as members were entering the House. "I was witness to a lane," he says, "made in both the Palace Yards, and no man could pass but whom the rabble gave leave to, crying *A good lord!* or *A good man! Let him pass!* I did see the Bishop of Lincoln's gown torne as he passed from the stair-head into the entry that leads to the Lords' house."—*Forster's "Arrest."*

A Mob in the Irish House of Parliament.—Mr. O'Flanagan describes the popular ferment that broke out in Dublin, December 3, 1759, when the rumour got abroad of a contemplated union between Great Britain and Ireland. Having beset the passages of the Houses of Parliament, "the mob proceeded to all the lengths that vulgar and depraved tastes could suggest. To show their contempt for the House, they brought a feeble old woman and seated her on the throne, where, like King Artaxemanes in 'Bombastes Furioso,' they placed a pipe in her mouth, and insisted on her smoking. They made a sudden irruption into the House of Commons, and were about to make a bonfire of the Journals, when, by way of diversion, they proposed to hang Rigby, who on November 21 previously had been made Master of the Rolls. Rigby most likely got a hint of these lawless proceedings, and he prudently went into the country, so that when they went to his house with the

determination of executing him on a gallows which they prepared for his use, he was not to be found."—*Lives of the Irish Chancellors.*

Hissing a Minister.—The division on the first reading of Conway's motion for the repeal of the Stamp Act took place February 22, 1766, when it was carried by a majority of 275 against 167. Conway, as he left the House, was greeted by three loud cheers. On the other hand, hisses and revilings assailed Grenville. Horace Walpole, in his "Memoirs," says: "The crowd pressed on Grenville with scorn and hisses. He, swelling with rage and mortification, seized the nearest man to him by the collar. Providentially, the fellow had more humour than spleen. 'Well,' if I may not hiss,' said he, 'at least I may laugh'—and laughed in Grenville's face. The jest caught—had the fellow been surly and resisted, a tragedy had probably ensued."

A First and Last Speech.—Lord North's son, Frederick, afterwards Lord Guilford, said, "I once attempted to speak in Parliament, and it was not unnatural when I rose that my family name should at once fix every eye upon me. I brought out two or three sentences, when a mist seemed to rise before my eyes; I then lost my recollection, and could see nothing but the Speaker's wig, which swelled, and swelled, and swelled till it covered the whole House. I then sank back on my seat, and never attempted another speech, but quickly accepted the Chiltern Hundreds, assured that Parliament was not my vocation."—*Harford's "Recollections of Wilberforce."*

Once and Always.—Colonel Birch, who sat in the House of Commons, 1675, had a coarse but ready wit, with which he retorted without distinction on all assailants. Sir Edward Seymour, or Mr. Coventry, in the course of a debate, reflected upon his former occupation of a carrier. Birch replied, with justifiable contempt, "It is very true, as that gentleman says, I *once* was a carrier; and let me tell

that gentleman it is very fortunate for him that he never was a carrier; for if he had, he would have been a carrier *still.*"—*Burnet's "History."*

A Dunce.—Lord William Poulet, though often chairman of committees of the House of Commons, was a great dunce, and could scarce read. Being to read a bill for naturalising Jemima, Duchess of Kent, he called her Jeremiah, Duchess of Kent.—*Walpoliana.*

The Oats and the Geese.—Henry, youngest son of the second Viscount Falkland, was so thoughtlessly extravagant, that he actually sold his father's unequalled library for a horse and a mare. He was not, however, without parts, as the following anecdote will show. Being brought early into the House of Commons, as member for Oxfordshire, and a grave senator objecting to his youth, and to his not looking as if he had sowed his wild oats, he replied, "Then I am come to the properest place, where are so many geese to pick them up."—*Life of Viscount Falkland.*

An Appropriate Illustration.—Lord Commissioner Maynard, in the Parliament of 1689, was particularly severe against the administration of the navy. "I hear," said he, "there are young men put to command ships that never were at sea before, because they are well affected to the present settlement. The question used to be, 'Is he a godly man?' and he was employed. I ask them, Can a godly man, because he is godly, make a watch or a pair of boots?"—*Parliamentary History.*

Taking a Joke Leisurely.—Mr. Clayton, the husband of the Queen's (Caroline, wife of George II.) favourite, got into Parliament and made himself useful to the ministry, for which he received ample recompense. He became one of the Lords of the Treasury, and, though remarkable for nothing but dulness, was eventually created an Irish baron, with the title of Sundon. Bubb Doddington, who managed on very small resources to acquire a reputation for smart-

ness, was once reproved by a brother Commissioner of the Treasury for not doing justice to Lord Sundon's quickness of perception, as he had laughed at something Doddington had just uttered. "No, no," exclaimed Doddington, "my Lord Sundon is only now appreciating a jest I made last Treasury day."—*Warburton's "Memoirs of Walpole."*

Use of Ecclesiastical Dignities.—Sir Edward Dering, member for Kent, who spoke in the debate on the Grand Remonstrance, taking up the closing averments in the Declaration, as to the desire of its promoters for the advancement of learning by a more general and equal distribution of its rewards, he avowed his opinion that this object would be defeated if the great prizes in the Church were abolished. "Great rewards," he said, "do beget great endeavours; and certainly, sir, when the great basin and ewer are taken out of the lottery, you shall have few adventurers for small plate and spoons only. If any man could cut the moon out all into little stars, although we might still have the same moon, or as much in small pieces, yet we should want both light and influence." Sydney Smith's famous argument in defence of the "prizes in the Church" was exactly and almost literally reproduced from this speech of Sir Edward Dering.—*Forster's "Grand Remonstrance."*

"Dragons' Teeth."—On the 24th of November, 1779, Mr. Grattan proposed the following short and decisive resolution in the Irish Parliament:—"That at this time it would be inexpedient to grant new taxes." This was carried against the Government by a majority of 123. On the ensuing day it was moved that the appropriated duties should be granted for six months only. This also was carried against the Government by a majority of thirty-eight. It was on this debate that Mr. Burgh, then Prime Serjeant, made his brilliant speech, which produced such electric effects in the House and galleries, but which in the Viceroy's letter is termed "great violence." They rose in

a mass and cheered him repeatedly as he concluded—"Talk not to me of peace; Ireland is not in a state of peace; it is smothered war. England has sown her laws like dragons' teeth, and they have sprung up in armed men."—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

"Measures, not Men."—Addressing the House of Commons, November 2, 1830, Mr. Brougham said: "I beg here to state that, as a general principle, my intention is to support measures which meet with my approbation, and to oppose those of contrary tendency, let the one or the other come from whom they may. * * * It is necessary, however, that I should qualify the doctrine of its being not men, but measures, that I am determined to support. * * * In a monarchy it is the duty of Parliament to look at the men as well as the measures; because a set of men might make a treaty which would render war inevitable at some distant day, unless the honour and safety of the country were sacrificed. I say, therefore, as long as a set of men can act secretly, that we are imperatively called upon to look at them and their character, as well as at the measures they propound."—*Hansard.*

"Looming in the Future."—Mr. Disraeli, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, issued an address to his constituents, the electors of Buckinghamshire, in June, 1852, in which he announced the approaching dissolution of Parliament. Referring to a revision of our taxation, he said: "The times are favourable to such an undertaking; juster notions of taxation are more prevalent than heretofore; powerful agencies are stirring, which have introduced new phenomena into finance, and altered the complexion of the fiscal world; and the possibility of greatly relieving the burdens of the community, both by adjustment and reduction, seems to loom in the future."

"Educating his Party."—Mr. Disraeli, while Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer, was entertained at a banquet by the Conservatives of Edinburgh, October 29th, 1867, when he went into an elaborate review of the subject of Reform, and defended the bill which had been passed, under his management, by the Government of Lord Derby. Speaking of the interval between 1860 and the period when the Conservative measure was introduced, he said (*Times* report):—"During that period of seven years, with the advice, I may say under the instructions of my colleagues, I expressed the principles upon which any measure of parliamentary reform ought to be established. Now, mark this, because these are things which you may not have heard in any speech which has been made in the city of Edinburgh. I had to prepare the mind of the country, and to educate—if it be not arrogant to use such a phrase—to educate our party. It is a large party, and requires its attention to be called to questions of this kind with some pressure. I had to prepare the mind of Parliament and of the country on this question of reform. This was not only with the concurrence of Lord Derby, but of my colleagues."

A "Gigantic Innovation."—In the debate that took place July 5th, 1860, on the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the bill for the abolition of the Paper Duties which had been sent up from the Lower House, Mr. Gladstone (Chancellor of the Exchequer) said:—"It appears to me to be the determination of one moiety of this House that there shall be no debate upon the constitutional principles which are involved in this question; and I must say that, considering that gentlemen opposite are upon this occasion the partisans of a gigantic innovation—the most gigantic and the most dangerous that has been attempted in our times—I may compliment them upon the prudence that they show in resolving to be its silent partisans. Now, sir, I should like to know with what language and in what

tones those gentlemen who assume the name of Conservative politicians would argue in support of a great encroachment by one house of the legislature upon the other."—*Hansard.*

A "Fortuitous Concourse of Atoms."—In announcing the dissolution of Parliament consequent upon the division on the question of the Chinese War (March 5th, 1857), Lord Palmerston, referring to the combination of parties which had produced the majority adverse to his Government, said:—"Combination implies a certain degree of similarity and identity of feeling. Now the right honourable gentleman opposite (Mr. Disraeli) in what he stated to the House spoke with a calmness, a temper, and a statesman-like view of a great occasion, which did honour to himself and to the party of which he is the leader. The right honourable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Gladstone), however, was carried away by an impetuosity and irritation of mind which certainly did not betoken any previous concert with the right honourable gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire, and which will, I think, be considered by him an unfortunate omen for that co-operation which is to follow the assumed combination between them. I said nothing to-night with regard to combination or conspiracy, or anything, I believe, which could give offence to anyone; I did state that which is a fact. You may call it combination; you may call it the accidental and fortuitous concourse of atoms; you may call it the accidental meeting of different gentlemen in one lobby; but I say that when gentlemen are in the habit of finding themselves in the same lobby, it is not unnatural to suppose that they may, under certain circumstances, be ready to unite themselves together for forming an administration, and become responsible for the opinions which they severally entertain."—*Hansard.*

Reading Speeches in the House.—The following

entry occurs in the "Diary of Lord Colchester" (Mr. Speaker Abbott):—"May 14, 1806. Mr. Jeffery having read a long *written* speech without interruption, I mentioned it to Mr. Fox, towards the end of it, and also to Mr. Canning, that I should take notice of this impropriety, which they severally agreed to be highly proper to do; and accordingly, before putting the question, I called the attention of the House to it, and stated this to be a practice contrary to the received and established usage of debate, and necessary to be remarked upon, lest it should grow into a precedent. To which interposition the House entirely assented. At the close of the debate, Mr. Jeffery again reading written arguments in reply, I was called upon to interfere; and it seemed to be agreed that this was not to be done at all, except so far as resorting to notes or figures. I had in my mind the reprobation of this very practice of reading written arguments, as mentioned in vol. ii. of Grey's 'Debates.'"

A Voluble Member.—Of a member of Parliament who, after having harangued for some hours in the House of Commons, came into a company where Dr. Johnson was, and endeavoured to talk him down, the doctor said, "This man has a pulse in his tongue."—*Sir John Hawkins.*

"Great Wisdom" in Parliament.—Old Thomas Fuller, writing the character of the "true gentleman," says: "If chosen a member of Parliament, he is willing to do his country service. If he be no rhetorician, to raise affections, (yea, Mercury was a greater speaker than Jupiter himself!) he counts it great wisdom to be the good manager of 'Yea' and 'Nay.'"

A Foreign Critic in the House.—Mr. Moritz, a Prussian divine who visited England in 1782, wrote a series of letters descriptive of his travels. In the metropolis he made his way to the House of Commons, "where," says he, "I now, for the first time, saw the whole of the British

nation assembled in its representatives, in a rather mean-looking building, that not a little resembles a chapel. The Speaker, an elderly man, dressed in an enormous wig, with two knotted curls behind, and a black cloak, with a hat on his head, sat opposite to me on a lofty chair. The members have nothing particular in their dress; they even come into the House in their great-coats, and with boots and spurs. It is not at all uncommon to see a member lying stretched out on one of the benches while others are debating; some crack nuts, others eat oranges, or whatever else is in season. * * * Two short-hand writers sat not far from me, who endeavoured to take down the words of the speakers; and thus all that is very remarkable may generally be read in print next day. The short-hand writers are supposed to be employed and paid by the editors of the different newspapers, and are constant attendants on the Parliament; and so they pay the door-keeper a fee for the session. I have seen some of the members bring their sons, while quite little boys, and carry them to their seats along with them."

Parliamentary Precedent.—Thanks of Parliament to Schomberg and Wellington.—The House of Commons had, with general approbation, compensated Schomberg's losses and rewarded his services by a grant of a hundred thousand pounds. Before he set out for Ireland, he requested permission to express his gratitude for this magnificent present. A chair was set for him within the bar. He took his seat there with the mace at his right hand, rose, and in a few graceful words returned his thanks, and took his leave. The Speaker replied that the Commons could never forget the obligation under which they already lay to his grace, that they saw him with pleasure at the head of an English army, that they felt entire confidence in his zeal and ability, and that, at whatever distance he might be, he would always be in a peculiar manner an

object of their care. The precedent set on this interesting occasion was followed with the utmost minuteness, a hundred and twenty-five years later, on an occasion more interesting still. Exactly on the same spot on which, in July, 1689, Schomberg had acknowledged the liberality of the nation, a chair was set, in July, 1814, for a still more illustrious warrior, who came to return thanks for a still more splendid mark of public gratitude. Few things illustrate more strikingly the peculiar character of the English government and people than the circumstance that the House of Commons, a popular assembly, should, even in a moment of joyous enthusiasm, have adhered to ancient forms with the punctilious accuracy of a College of Heralds; that the sitting and rising, the covering and the uncovering, should have been regulated by exactly the same etiquette in the nineteenth century as in the seventeenth; and that the same mace which had been held at the right hand of Schomberg should have been held in the same position at the right hand of Wellington.—*Macaulay's "History of England."*

Thanks of the House to General Fairfax.—Speaker Lenthal, in the course of his speech giving the thanks of the House to General Fairfax in 1646, made use of the following high-flown phrases:—"Heretofore, when I read the histories of the acts of famous princes and warriors in this or other nations, it was not without some jealousy that in them there was some mixture and glosses of oratory and art, the more to set off and give lustre to their acts, as arguments of emulation for others to follow the footsteps of their virtues; but the actions of your excellency will add lustre and belief to them, being all verified in you. And, indeed, here considering the swift marches, and the expedition of those grand and difficult attempts, which were prosecuted and effected by your excellency, I may say the Almighty came riding on the wings of the

wind; for these were nothing else but the *Magnalia Dei*, acted in and by you, his instrument."—*Parliamentary History.*

An Admiral on his Beam-ends.—Vice-Admiral Sir Alan, afterwards Lord, Gardner, being at the time member for Plymouth, was to receive the thanks of the House, in his place in Parliament, for his share in the naval victory obtained over the French, June 1st, 1794. "On the day appointed, before the commencement of business" (says Dean Pellew in his "Life of Lord Sidmouth"), "he entered the Speaker's private room in great agitation, and expressed his apprehensions that he should fail in properly acknowledging the honour which he was about to receive. 'I have often been at the cannon's mouth,' he said, 'but hang me if ever I felt as I do now! I have not slept these three nights. Look at my tongue.' The Speaker rang for a bottle of Madeira, and Sir Alan took a glass. After a short time he took a second, and then said he felt somewhat better; but when the moment of trial arrived, and one of the bravest of a gallant profession, whom no personal danger could appal, rose to reply to the Speaker, he could scarcely articulate. He was encouraged by enthusiastic cheers from all parts of the House; but, after stammering out with far more than the usual amount of truth that 'he was overpowered by the honour that had been conferred upon him,' and vainly attempting to add a few more words, he relinquished the idea as hopeless, and abruptly resumed his seat amidst a renewed burst of cheers."

The "Garter" in the Commons.—Horace Walpole writes in 1772:—"Lord North is likely to have the Duke of Saxe-Gotha's vacant garter, the only one, except my father's, that has shone in the House of Commons since Queen Elizabeth's days." North had the garter, which has since but rarely been bestowed on statesmen sitting in the Lower House. A notable instance was that of Lord

Palmerston. It was offered to the younger Pitt and to Sir Robert Peel, but declined by both.

The Wensleydale Life Peerage.—In January, 1856, the Government of Lord Palmerston determined to try the experiment of creating life peerages, and Sir James Parke, a Baron of the Court of Exchequer, was created Lord Wensleydale, "for and during the term of his natural life." A long debate ensued on the subject in the House of Lords, and a Committee of Privileges was appointed by the House to inquire into the legality of life peerages. The committee reported, in February, that such a creation could not confer the right to sit and vote in Parliament; and in consequence, a patent of peerage was made out in the following July in the usual form, with remainder to "the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten."

Cats and Parliaments.—Charles I. said that "Parliaments are like cats; they grow curst with age."—*Hallam's "Constitutional History."*

How Long will Fresh Parliament "Keep"?—In the course of a debate which arose on the Triennial Bill in 1693, a speaker amused the House with the following argument in support of the bill:—"Parliaments," he said, "resembled the manna which God bestowed on the chosen people. They were excellent while they were *fresh;* but if kept too long they became noisome, and foul worms were engendered by the corruption of that which had been sweeter than honey." Grave analogical misgivings as to the durability of new parliamentary materials have compressed themselves into the following query: How long will new "Parliament" *keep* without becoming offensive?—*Correspondent of "Notes and Queries."*

A Figurative and a Literal Dissolution.—Lord Chief Justice North dined with the Duke of Lauderdale at Ham, says Roger North in his "Life of Guilford," when "both these counsellors were as blown deer, and would

be glad to have the Parliament dissolved; of which, to say the truth, the whole nation was weary. And at this time the frost was very sharp, and the company at dinner complained of cold. The duke turned round, and, looking back towards the window, said, 'There will be a thaw soon.' None at the table but his lordship guessed at his meaning. And so he intended it; for he knew that the Parliament would in a few days be dissolved, but his lordship did not, till he guessed so from that sentence of the duke's; and it proved accordingly. And so the duke *discovered* and at the same time *kept* the grand secret, which was a fine turn of a politician."

Office and the Grave.—On one occasion in the Irish Parliament, Mr. Denis Daly attacked Hussey Burgh, and did it well. Burgh had voted against a motion condemning the Embargo, having on a former occasion opposed it. Burgh at that time held office, and, alluding to him, Daly said, "The Treasury bench resembles the grave; it levels all distinctions."—*Grattan's Life and Times.*

A Qualification for Office.—Lord Sidmouth used occasionally to amuse his friends with stories of a well-known humorist, Mr. Ferguson of Pitfour, who held a seat in the House when his lordship was Speaker. That gentleman used to insist that the government ought always to select a tall man to fill the office of Lord Advocate. "We Scotch members," he said, "always vote with the Lord Advocate, and we require, therefore, to see him in a division. Now, I can see Mr. Pitt, and I can see Mr. Addington; but I cannot see the Lord Advocate."—*Sidmouth's Life and Correspondence.*

An Apple-stall Question in Parliament.—In July, 1851, Mr. Bernal Osborne put a question to Lord Seymour, the First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, respecting the eviction of Ann Hicks from Hyde Park, to which, as appears from "Hansard," the noble lord replied in substance

as follows:—In 1843, Ann Hicks had a little stall where she sold apples and ginger beer in the Park; subsequently, on application to the Commissioners, she obtained permission to erect a wooden stand in which to lock up her commodities. Step by step, and in accordance with successive concessions made to the pertinacity of Mrs. Hicks, the stand of wood became a stand of brick—the stand of brick a small hut five feet in height—the roof of the hut, under pretence of repairing a leak, acquired further elevation, and was surmounted by a chimney. A bit of garden ground seems to have been the next object of Ann's cupidity, and this she took upon herself to appropriate, enclosing it with hurdles. The hurdles were continually advancing and encroaching upon the Park, in proportion to the forbearance of the authorities and the acquisitiveness of Mrs. Ann Hicks. Such a state of things could not, of course, be permitted to continue. The Duke of Wellington, as Ranger of the Park, the Crown solicitors, and the Commissioners had to bring into exercise their combined powers, and a small sum of money had to be paid by way of compensation before the intruder could be ejected. The woman, it appeared, made some pretence of holding a house in the Park by the gift of George II., but this had no further foundation than her own delusion or invention.

The Mystery of the Hat.—One of the Irish members, a gentleman much and deservedly respected, and a man of considerable wealth, was singularly negligent in his dress; wearing habiliments, and especially a hat, of very ancient date. This gentleman, as representative of a very important locality, had occasion several times to call at the Irish Office, and had been always received with the peculiarly bland courtesy that marked the noble lord (Morpeth) then at the head of that office. Somewhere about the middle of June or July, 1835, Mr. R. (the honourable member in question) called, and, after a very brief delay, was admitted to Lord Morpeth. After the usual courtesies and the usual

banale observations on the weather, it is recorded that Lord Morpeth looked rather inquiringly at his visitor. "I am come, my lord, to thank your lordship," said the latter, answering the look promptly; "I am greatly obliged to your lordship!" "Oh-h-h! Mr. R.," said Lord Morpeth, not recollecting exactly what he was thanked for, but supposing it must have been some attention to one of Mr. R.'s recommendations, "I am very happy that you are so satisfied. I shall be always happy to be of any service in my power." "I am much obliged to your lordship; it was very kind of you; I could not, and I did not, mistake your motive for a moment; and I beg to say, I shall always be obliged to your lordship for such communications." The mystified secretary stared a little at some of the terms of this address; but seeing that his visitor, however strangely he expressed himself, appeared thoroughly and warmly in earnest, he made the best of it by again bowing, and expressing again his desire always to give similar satisfaction. "I am quite sure of it, my lord; and I am, I beg again to say, greatly obliged to your lordship; and here, my lord, here is—my hat." "Your hat, Mr. R.!" "Yes, my lord, my hat! I hope your lordship approves of it." "Oh-h! Certainly—certainly, Mr. R., it is a very nice hat indeed—*very*—but——" "I am very glad your lordship likes it. I assure you I took great pains to get one which you would consider unobjectionable, and to prove to you what a value I place upon your advice." "My advice! Mr. R." (looking aghast, and half inclined to ring the bell)—"My advice!" "Yes, my lord, according to your own note here." And to Lord Morpeth's amazement he was handed a note, addressed as from himself to Mr. R., representing in the kindest, most considerate, and indeed affectionate manner, that such was the writer's solicitude for the proper estimation of the Irish M.P.'s, that he was induced to step beyond the limits, not only of his

office, but of the privileges of ordinary acquaintance, to suggest in private and strict confidence to Mr. R. "that his hat was not exactly what a gentleman of his position and wealth ought to wear!"—*John O'Connell's "Recollections."*

Women in Parliament.—The ladies of birth and quality sat in council with the Saxon Witas. In Wightred's great council at Beconceld, A.D. 694, the Abbesses sat and deliberated, and five of them signed the decrees of that council, along with the King, bishops, and nobles. In Henry III. and Edward I.'s time four Abbesses were summoned to Parliament, viz., of Shaftesbury, Berking, St. Mary of Winchester, and of Wilton. In the 35th of Edward III. were summoned by writ to Parliament, to appear there by their proxies, Countess of Norfolk, Countess of Ormond, Countess of March, Countess of Pembroke, Countess of Oxford, and Countess of Athol. These ladies were called "*ad colloquium et tractatum* by their proxies."—*Gurdon's "History of Parliament."*

Women as Witnesses.—On the 12th of February, 1620, Mr. Lovell complains that one Dayrell had threatened his person. He is brought to the bar, and denies the words charged against him. He is ordered to attend next day with his witnesses, one of whom proved to be a woman. Mr. Crewe and Sir Edward Coke gravely opposed her being called in to be examined; objecting, on the authority of St. Bernard, "That a woman ought not to speak in the congregation." A committee is therefore appointed to go out and examine her at the door.—*Hatsell's "Precedents, &c."*

Women Petitioners.—On the 4th of February, 1641, a singular petition was presented to the Commons, from several gentlewomen and tradesmen's wives in the City. On the last day of sitting these female zealots were observed to crowd much about the door of the Commons, and Sergeant-major Skippon, the commander of the guard, had applied to the House to know what to do with them,

the women telling him, That where there was one now, there would be five hundred the next day; and that it was as good for them to die there as at home. The House advised him to speak them fair and send them home again. But this day they were as good as their words; they came down in great numbers and presented a petition to the Commons, which was received and read. The prayer of the petition was for the "putting down of Popery and Idolatry."* The petition was presented by Mrs. Anne Stagg, a gentlewoman and brewer's wife. Mr. Pym came to the door and thanked them for the petition, promising that it would receive due attention, and requested the petitioners to return home.—*Parliamentary History.*

* Butler alludes, most probably, to this circumstance in the following couplet:—

"The oyster-women locked their fish up,
And trudged away to cry, No bishop!"

INDEX.

A

Abashing the House, 113.
Abbott, Mr. Speaker, 273.
Absentee, A Royal, 9.
Absentees, 358, 360.
Absolute Falsehood in a King's Speech, 117.
Abusing Freedom of Speech, 366.
Abusive Language, 364.
Accident of an Accident, 288.
Acknowledgment, An, 114.
Actual Invasion, 260.
Adam, his Duel with Fox, 160.
Addington, Henry, 57.
Addison, Joseph, 59.
Adjourning the Poll, 320.
Adjournment of the House, 358.
Admiral, An, on his Beam-ends, 386.
Adulation, Oriental, 13.
Advantages of Public Virtue, 183.
Æolus Canning, 132.
Agamemnon and Achilles, 257.
Agnew, Sir Andrew, 59.
Agreed, 215.
Airing his Vocabulary, 140.
All Men have their Price, 301.
"All the Talents," 48.
Alone in the Lobby, 362.
Altered Circumstances, 172.
Althorp, Lord, 274.
American Colonies, 85.
American War of Independence, 124.
Anger, Different Kinds of, 87.
Angry Boy, The, 276.
"Another Place," 355.
Answer a Speech like that, 173.
Apology, An Earl's, 10.
Apology, Reluctant, 222.
Appeal to the Jury, An, 148.
Apple-stall Question, 388.
Archdeacon, What is an? 186.
Artist, An, on a Canvass, 375.
Arresting a Servant, 366.
Arrest, Freedom from, 365.
As Bad as the Other House, 364.
Ashby and White, 43.
Assimilation of Members and Constituencies, 194.
Astounding the House, 270.
Atterbury, Bishop, 60.
Auctioneer and Parliamentary Honours, 331.
Audience, Giving or Receiving one, 160.

B

Bacon, Lord, 61.
His Oratory, 62.
Balaam and his Ass, 60.
Balloon, The Lords in a, 167.
Bankers, Laughing at the, 221.
Barnard, Sir John, 62.
Baron Clackmannan, 132.
Barrington, Expulsion of, 367.
Bath and Garter, Orders of the, 296.
Bath, Lord, 264, 300.
Baths, The Two, 192.
"Bauble, The Fools'," 4.
Beast, The House of Commons a, 34.
"Beardless Boy," A, 213.
Beards and Principles, 281.
Bed-ridden Law, 374.
Begums Speech, The, 277.
Bellman, A, Wanted, 226.
Bentinck, Lord George, 63.
Best and Pleasantest Club, 240.

Bet on Horace, 264.
Betrayed by his Hat, 286.
Bible of the English Constitution, 124.
Biding his Time, 87.
Billingsgate, Petition from, 220.
Birch, Colonel, the Carrier, 377.
Bishop, Complaint against a, 20.
Bishops, Elizabeth and the, 17.
Bishops in the Lords, 85.
Bishops, Love and Hatred for, 154.
Blackguard Supporters, 293.
Black Hole of St. Stephen's, 131.
Black Rod, A Slight from, 23.
Bleeding for One's Country, 126.
Blue Ribbon of the Turf, 63.
Bolingbroke, Lord, 63.
  His Style, 64.
Boy Father of the Man, 169.
Boy Members, 22.
Brave Words, 273.
"Bray" of Exeter Hall, The, 203.
Breach of Privilege, 366.
Bribery, 117.
  And Gratitude, 299.
  And Imprisonment, 321.
  First Conviction for, 320.
  Heavy Penalty for, 321.
  Persevering, 149.
  Of Members, 13, 299.
Bright, John, 64.
Brightest Star of our Orrery, 84.
Bringing forth Hercules, 106.
Bringing in the Sick, 297.
British Constitution, the, Safety of, 92.
Broffam or Broom, 69.
Brougham, Lord, 68.
  Asserting a Right, 76.
  Attack upon Canning, 69; upon the Duke of Cumberland, 76; upon Peel, 71.
  Election for Yorkshire, 72.
  Reform Speech in the Lords, 75.
  Interview with William IV., 73.
Broughton, Lord, 78.
  His Pamphlet, "A Trifling Mistake," 78.
Burglary at the Chancellor's, 284.
Bull, A, 83.
Bulwark of Liberty, 279.
Burdett, Sir Francis, 79.
  A High Tory, 81.
  Byron's Opinion of him, 79.
  Committal to the Tower, 80.
  Duel with Mr. Paull, 81.
  Successful Reply to Canning, 80.
Burke, Edmund, 82.
  A Bull by him, 83.
  Canvassing, 91.
  A False Quantity, 83.
  Dagger Scene, The, 92.
  His First Speech, 82.
  Entertaining his Friends, 91.
  In the Strangers' Gallery, 82.
  Opposition to him, 88.
  Rupture with Fox, 89.
Burleigh, Lord, on Parliament, 2.
Bute, Lord, 94.
  A Disguise, 94.
Buxton, Sir T. F., 94.
Byron, Lord, 95.
  His First Speech, 95.
  His Parliamentary Impressions, 97.

C

Cabal, The, 38.
Cabinet Council in Bed, A, 119.
Cabinet, Origin of the, 37.
Caging the Voters, 338.
Calendar, Reform of the, 126.
Calming the House, 220.
Camden, Earl; last Public Utterance, 98.
Campbell and Brougham, 77.
Campbell's Character of Walpole, 301.
Candidate and Constituents, 182.
Candid Avowal, 172.
Candid Debater, A, 192.
Candles, Motion for, 358.
Canine Member, A, 220.
Canning, 99.
  Attacked by Brougham, 69.
  Duel with Castlereagh, 110.
  Maiden Speech, 99.
  On Parliamentary Reform, 101.
  Preparing for Debate, 101.
  His Death, 105.
Canvassing, Humours of, 182.
Cape Breton an Island? 217.
Caricature, A Living, 216.
Cartridge Speeches, 364.
Cart's Tail, Member Whipped at, 366.
Castlereagh, 107.
  His Oratory, 107.
  Mobbed with Sidmouth, 109.

Duel with Canning, 110.
A Lover of Ireland, 110.
His Death, 111.
Catching his Eye, 294.
Catholic Emancipation, 244.
Cats and Parliaments, 387.
Cavendish's "Debates," 344.
Cave of Adullam, 64.
Censure on the Speaker, Vote of, 294.
Champagne Speech, A, 293.
Chancellor in a Difficulty, 252.
Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Boys, 118.
Change of Opinion, 172, 244.
Challenge in the Lords, 370.
Character in Parliament, 189.
Charlemont, Lord, 352.
Charles I., First Meeting of Parliament, 23.
Charles II. "fooling" the Parliament, 34.
Charles II. and Andrew Marvell, 209.
Chartist Petition, 1848, 229.
Chatham, 111.
Terrible Cornet of Horse, The, 111.
His Oratory, 112, 114.
His Imposing Manner, 113.
Horrifying the French Minister, 114.
Long Speeches introduced by him, 115.
Address to the Tapestry, 115.
Employment of Indians, 116.
Rebuking the House, 117.
Elevation to the Peerage, 120.
Last Appearance in the House, 121.
Loved at Home, Feared Abroad, 121.
Power of his Name on the Continent, 121.
His Death, 121.
Examples of his Eloquence, 123.
Chesterfield, The Earl of, 126.
Chicken Taylor, 283.
Children in the House, 384.
Child's Ambition, A, 254.
Church and State, 85.
Church Establishments, 165.
Circumstances Altered, 39.
Civis Romanus sum, 233.
Clarendon, The Earl of, 128.
Clerical Member, A, 291.
Clinical Consultation, A, 119.
Close Reasoner, A, 172.
Coalition, 89, 199.
Coalition, Members of a, should Coalesce, 200.
Cobbett, William, 130.
First Appearance, 130.
Demeanour in the House, 130.
Influence in the House, 131.
Denunciation by Peel, 245.
Dispute with the Reporters, 354.
Cobden, Richard, 133.
Scene between him and Peel, 134.
Coke, Sir Edward, 135.
Cold Shoulder, The, 209.
Colonels, The Three, 224.
Colonies, Salutary Neglect of, 85.
Combination of Parties, 382.
Commons Turned out of the Lords, 345.
Compare us now, Boys, 227.
Comparison, Odious, 363.
Completing a Quotation, 192.
Compliment, A Generous, 167.
Compliment, Ambiguous, 278.
Compliment, Extracting a, 220.
Compliments from the Chair, 135.
Compromise, 85.
Compulsory Detention, 26.
Conference of the Two Houses; Scandalous Scenes, 33.
Confession of Error, 118.
Confide in You? 123.
Confidence a Plant of Slow Growth, 123.
Conquerors and Conquered, 182.
Conscience, Use of, 364.
Consistency, 151.
Constitutional Principles, 381.
Convenient Illustration, 314.
Conveyance of Electors, 321.
Correct Costume, 368.
Cotton-Spinners and Prime Ministers, 244.
Counsellor, An Unwise, 6.
Counting himself Out, 361.
Coup-de-État, The, in France, 235.
Coup-de-main in Chancery, 313.
Courage and Insult, 109.
Court Candidate, A, 318.
Court Dictation in Elections, 317.
Court Insult, 368.
Coventry, Sir John, 137.
"Cowardly Scoundrel," 313.
Creating an Historian, 375.

Credo quia impossibile, 186.
Crimean War, Cost of, 67.
Cromwell, Oliver, 138.
His House of Lords, 31.
Crowds at Westminster, 357.
Crown not Worth Wearing, 125.
Crown, The, Influence of, 46.
Crumbling Russia, 134.
Crushing Indifference, 170.
Cumberland, Duke of, 178.
Attacked by Brougham, 76.
Curran, John Philpot, 139.
His First Constituency, 139.
Duel with Fitzgibbon, 140.
Currency Laws, The, 241.
Currycomb of the House, 109.
Curtain Lecture, 119.

D

Dancing Punch, 334.
Dagger Scene, The, 92.
Danger, A Standing, 43.
Dangers of Eloquence, 198.
Dashwood, Chancellor, 118.
Day of No Judgment, 92.
Dead, yet Speaking, 135.
Deane, Sir Robert, 352.
Debate, Freedom of, 21.
Debates, Publication of, 350.
Debates, Publication of Irish, 353.
Debates, Fox on their Publication, 353.
Debating, Parliamentary, 142.
Debate without Reason, 38.
Defending the Absent, 176.
Delaying a Writ, 316.
Deliberate Aim, A, 140.
Deluge, Subsidence of the, 101.
Democracy, 199; Stemming the Tide of, 144.
Denouncing the House, 372.
Den of Thieves, A, 208.
Denying himself, 312.
Departed Glory, 283.
Depopulation, 61.
Deputation, Preparing for a, 213.
Derby, Earl of, 141.
His Manner, 141.
His First Speech, 141.
Rupert of Debate, The, 144.
Derby Dilly, The, 224.
Derby Minstrels, The, 67.
Desecrating the Throne, 376.
Despair and Terror Produced, 162.
Despatch, A Puzzling, 103.
Despatch of Business, 18.
D'Esterre, his Duel with O'Connell, 225.
D'Ewes and Note-taking, 350.
Dignity of Parliament, 45, 117.
Dilemma, A, 44.
Dinner, The Rush to, 372.
Dinner-Bell of the House, 373.
Dinner to Voters, 323.
Dirty House, A, 327.
Discharging a Member, 373.
Discourage the Young Ones, 179.
Disestablishment, Church, 165.
Disgrace is Prudence, 124.
Disparaging the Peers, 265.
Disraeli, Benjamin, 146, 271.
His First Appearance, 146.
Disreputable Representative, A, 337.
Dissolution, Terrors of a, 335.
Dissolution, The, of 1780, 47; of 1831, 49.
Dissolution, Figurative and Literal, 387.
Dissolution or Interruption? 33.
Disturbances, Early Election, 315.
Disturbance, Making a, 304.
"Ditto to Mr. Burke," 92.
Divine Right, 294.
Division, A Disputed, 38; Counting a Stranger in a, 349.
Division Lists First Printed, 43.
Doctor, The, 178.
Doddington, Bubb, 378.
Dragons' Teeth, Sowing, 379.
Drawbacks, 299.
Draymen and Shoemakers in the Lords, 31.
Dream, A, Related, 24.
Drifting into War, 128.
Driving the Americans with a Crutch, 125.
Drowsy Members, 207.
Duelling Clubs, Political, 369.
Duel, Preventing a, 274.
Duels:—Burdett and Paull, 81.
Canning and Castlereagh, 110.
Curran and Fitzgibbon, 140.
Fox and Adam, 160.
Lord G. Germain and Governor Johnstone, 371.
O'Connell and D'Esterre, 225.
Pitt and Tierney, 289.
Shelburne and Fullarton, 275.

Wellington and Winchilsea, 306.
Wilkes and Martin, 312.
Dumb House, A, 215.
Dunce, A, for Chairman, 378.
Duncombe, T. S., 149.
Duplicity, Charge of, 274.
Dutch Commerce, Canning on, 103.

E

Early Hours in Parliament, 357.
Earwigging the Parliament, 42.
Easy Virtue, 280.
Ecclesiastical Prizes, 379.
Educating his Party, 380.
Eldon, Lord, 150.
First Election Speech, 150.
"Never Ratted," 151.
Election, Making Sure, 91.
Elections, 315.
Elections, Illegal, 318.
Electioneering Strategy in 1685, 319.
Election Expenses in 1865, 335.
Elegant Contingency, An, 330.
Elevation, Convenient, 27.
Elizabeth, Enraging Queen, 16.
Elizabeth and the Bishops, 17.
Eloquence, Parliamentary, 63.
Elwes, the Miser, 152.
Empson and Dudley, 297.
Encroaching Democracy, 145.
Encroachment by the Lords, 382.
Endurance of the People, 182.
England can Never be Ruined but by a Parliament, 2.
English Colonists, Enterprise of, 85.
Equivocal Compliment, 150.
Erskine, Lord, 152.
Maiden Speech and Failure, 152.
Contemptuous Treatment from Pitt, 152.
Eulogy, Misunderstood, 268.
Etiquette, Irish, 368.
Europe on a Mine, 129.
Eve in the Commons, 260.
Evelyn, John, on Elections, 323.
Even Temper, 299.
Every Man's House his Castle, 125.
Every Numerous Assembly a Mob, 127.
Example for Statesmen, 127.
Exceptions, 260.
Exchanging Looks, 187.
Excitement in Debate, 296.
Exclusion of Clergymen, 292.
Exclusion of Strangers, 344.
Ex Luce Lucellum, 356.
Express-train Oratory, 201.
Expulsion of Barrington, 367.
Expulsion of Irish Students, 175.

F

Failure, A, 377.
Fairfax receiving Thanks, 385.
Falkland, Lord, and the Bishops, 154.
Fall, A Disastrous, 124.
False Quantity, A, 83.
Fasting and Fighting, 373.
Fatal Joke, 361.
Fat and Lean Voters, 323.
Father and Son, 241.
Father Murphy's Eyebrows, 342.
Fazakerly, 181.
Felix Trembles, 113.
Felon Transformed, The, 262.
Fighting and Fasting, 373.
Fighting and Speaking, 282.
Finality in Reform, 243.
Finch, Lord, 282.
Fines for Absence, 358; for Late Arrival, 359.
First and Last Speech, 377.
Fitzgerald, Vesey, 226.
Fixing a Charge, 113.
Flattery by Mr. Speaker, 136.
Flattery Rebuked, 13.
Flood, Henry, 155.
Fly in Amber, The, 231.
Fools and Profane, 207.
Fools and Rogues, 312.
"Fools' Bauble," The, 4.
Forbearance in Debate, 364.
Forbidding the Banns, 258.
Foreign Critic, A, 383.
Foreigner, A, at an Election, 327.
Foreign Secretary, Power of the, 236.
Foreign Troops, Employment of, 125.
Forgery in the Journals, 33.
Fortuitous Concourse of Atoms, 382.
Fortunate Precaution, A, 86.
Forty Days' Tyranny, 46.
Fourth Estate, The, 354.
Fox, Charles James, 156, 287.
First Appearance, 156.
Early Speeches, 156.

Characteristics of his Oratory, 158.
Struck out of the Privy Council, 159.
Duel with Mr. Adam, 160.
His Character by Grattan, 160.
Range of his Genius, 160.
Heart and Intellect, 160.
His Grave, 161.
His Rupture with Burke, 89.
His Influence over Grey, 179.
Leadership of the Commons, 217.
On the Publication of Debates, 353.
Fox and Pitt in Childhood, 156.
Fox and Goose, 289.
France and Treaties of Peace, 182.
Francis, Sir Philip, 87, 162.
Franking Letters, 367.
Freedom, A Friend of, 98.
Freedom from Arrest, 365.
Freedom of Speech, 42.
Freeholds, Splitting, 321.
Free Translation, 186.
Freemen, Honorary, 338.
French Minister and Chatham, 114.
"Fresh" Parliament, 387.
Fretting, 221.
Friend in Disguise, 181.
Friend's Defence, A, 176.
Friends of the People, 179.
Fullarton, Colonel, Duel with Shelburne, 275.

G

Gallant Contribution, A, 30.
Garrick Hiding himself, 348.
Garter, The, in the Commons, 386.
Garter and Bath, Orders of the, 296.
Genteel Abuse, 364.
Gentle Shepherd, 118.
Gentleman, A True, 383.
George III. no Listener, 160.
Germain's Duel with Governor Johnstone, 371.
Ghost in Hamlet, The, 165.
Gibbon, Edward, 162, 278.
Diplomatic Employment, 163.
Gigantic Innovation, 381.
Giggle Away the Great Charter, 213.
Gladstone, W. E., 163.
God and Our Country, 145.
God Forget You! 285.
Godly Qualification, A, 378.
Good Authority, 293.
Good Humour, 218.
Goose and Gosling, 55.
Gordon, Dr., 351.
Gordon, Lord George, 168.
Government, All, a Compromise, 287.
Grafton and Thurlow, 287.
Graham, Sir James, 169.
Grampound, Bribery at, 321.
Grand Remonstrance, The, 27.
Grant, Sir William, 172.
Grasshopper, Burke and the, 87.
Grattan, Henry, 173.
His Grant of £50,000, 174.
Reception in the English Commons, 177.
Grave of the Government, 273.
Grateful Supporter, 299.
Great Seal Stolen, 284.
Grey, Earl, 75, 177.
First Appearance, 177.
Dislike to Political Life, 178.
Grievance, A Forgotten, 96.
Grildrig, 257.
Groom of Bedchamber Censured, 360.
Grotesque Manner, 174.
Gunpowder Plot, The, 19.
Guthrie, Mr. William, 352.

H

Hale, Sir M., his Opinion of Parliament, 2.
Hammer it into Them, 159.
Hampden, John, 180.
"Hansard" Disposed of, 171.
Happy Despatch, 230.
Hardly Fair, Robin! 299.
Hard-hearted Metaphysician, 188.
Hard Looks, 187.
Hardwicke, Earl of, 180.
Harley, Robert, 181.
Hartley, David, 373.
Hastings, Warren, 86, 87.
Hat, A Very Nice, 390.
Hats Off! 170.
Hazardous Success, 124.
Heedless Rhetoric, 148.
Hemming a Member down, 18.
Henry VIII.'s Method with the Commons, 12.
Hereditary Representatives, 51.
Hint to Statesmen, 127.
His Majesty's Opposition, 79.
Hissing a Minister, 377.

Historical Conscience, 148.
History must be False, 300.
Hobhouse (Lord Broughton). Committed to Newgate, 78.
Holding the Pursestrings, 37.
Homely Saxon, 314.
Honorary Freemen, 338.
Honourable Distinction, An, 244.
Honour Asleep, 194.
Honourable and Religious Gentleman, 309.
Honourable Career, An, 271.
Honour, National and Personal, 371.
Honour of a Seat, 375.
Honour to Genius, 176.
Horatian Bet, A, 264.
Horner, Francis, 182.
Hospital for Invalids, 265.
Host, A, in himself, 268.
Hostages, Parliamentary, 6.
House of Commons not of much Importance, 159.
House of Rimmon, The, 208.
How long will Fresh Parliament keep? 387.
Humble Pie, Eating, 10.
Hume, Joseph, 184.
Hunt, Orator, 187.
Huskisson, 187.
His Death, 188.
His Difference with Wellington, 305.
Hustings Speech, A Short, 92.
Hustings Speech Plagiarised, A, 228.
Hustings Threat, A, 312.

I

Icicle Speech, An, 54.
Ignorant Eloquence, 282.
Ignorant Impatience of Taxation, 106, 108.
Illegal Elections, 318.
Illustration not Logic, 314.
ILLUSTRATIONS OF PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY, 1.
Impeachments, 22.
Imposing Aspect, An, 287.
Imprisonment for Bribery, 321.
Imprudence of Charles I., 30.
Impudent Silence, 221.
Inattentive House, An, 169.
Inconceivable, 185.
Inconsistency, 172, 197.
Indians, Employment of, 116.
Infamous Coalition, 219.
Infamous Conduct, 372.
Influence of Character, 189.
Inglis, Sir Robert, 189.
Innovation, A Gigantic, 381.
Inquiring after Robin, 300.
Insignificant Men, 300.
Inspired Orator, An, 259.
Insult and Courage, 109.
Insulting the Commons, 19.
Insulting the Court, 368.
Intense Glare at the Doors of Parliament, 65.
Interruption, Indecent, 178.
Intimidating Visage, 341.
Intimidation in Politics, 246.
Intolerance in the Commons, 36.
Intruder, An, 349.
Ireland, Supremacy over, 84.
Irish Church Disestablishment, 164.
Irish Elections, 338.
Irish Etiquette, 368.
Irish Parliament, Debates, 353.
Irish Barons, 124.
Irrepressible Oratory, Brougham's, 68.
Irresistible, 309.

J

Jack-boot, A, to lead the Commons, 218.
Jealousy between the two Houses, 46.
Jefferies, Judge, not "Parliament Proof," 40.
Jewish Disabilities, 50.
Johnson, Dr., 47, 352, 375.
Opinion of Walpole, 299.
Jokes and Facts, 279.
Joke, Slow Progress of a, 378.
Johnstone, Governor, Duel with Germain, 371.
Journals, Commencement of the, 14.
Judge, Petition against a, 11.
Judging a deceased Sovereign, 105.
Judicious Bottle-holding, 233.
Junius, 162.
Jupiter Relenting, 228.
Justice Shallow Oratory, 217.

K

Keeping the King waiting, 45.
Keeping the Peace, 340.
Keyhole Tactics, 297.
Kingdom, The, Undone, 125.
King of England cannot enter, 125.
"Kings" of the Lower House, The, 20.
King's Speech, General Objection to a, 130.
King's Speech, Infamous Falsehood in a, 117.
King's Speech not to allude to a Monarch's Death, 104.
King's Speech Off-hand, Speaking a, 261.
King's Word, Taking the, 136.
King, The, not a Gentleman, 304.

L

Ladies on Canvass, 337.
Lambs of Nottingham, The, 337.
Lame, Halt, and Blind, 298.
Land Tax, 252.
Language, The, of his Constituents, 220.
Laudable Ambition, 375.
Laurence, Dr., 190.
Law Amendment, 71.
Leader, A Courageous, 106.
Leadership of the Commons, 217, 307.
Leap in the Dark, A, 146.
Leaving the Lawyer behind, 283.
Legal Phraseology, 187.
Legitimate Expenses, 336.
Less exceeding the Greater, 341.
Letting Loose the Tap, 323.
Letter-Franking, 367.
Liberty, Defence of, 154.
Liberty, My Lords! 311.
Liberty of Speech in the Lords, 178.
Lie Direct, The, 298.
Life Peerage, The Wensleydale, 387.
Light out of Darkness, 107.
Lion and the Ass, 88.
Literary and Political Life Contrasted, 163.
Liverpool, Lord, 191.
Logic and Grammar, 293.
Logician, A, Out of Place, 293.
Long Speeches introduced by Chatham, 115.
Looming in the Future, 380.
Lopez, Imprisonment of Sir Manasseh, 321.
Lord Chancellor, Peremptory Offer, 180.
Lord's Prayer, Altering the, 30.
Lords, Earl Russell's Opinion of the, 272.
Lords, The, in a Balloon, 166.
Lords Turned out of the Commons, 345.
Losing Tallagh, 140.
Loughborough, Lord, 192.
Loved at Home, Feared Abroad, 121.
Lowe, Robert, 193.
Lucas, Dr., 195.
Luminous or Voluminous, 278.
Lycurgus of the Lower House, 213.
Lyndhurst, Lord, 196.
His Riddle to Brougham, 77.
Lyttelton, Lord, and the Reporters, 354.
Lytton, Lord, 198.

M

Macaulay, Lord, 200.
Characteristics as a Speaker, 203.
His Early Speeches, 202.
Mace, The, 355.
Magician's Wand, The, 158.
Magisterial Delinquents, 320.
Magna Charta Bed-ridden, 374.
Magnanimity, 299.
Maintaining his Point, 149.
Majorities, Fighting Against, 184.
Making Matters Agreeable, 210.
Malediction, A, 252.
Mansfield, Earl of, 205.
Pitt's Antagonism to him, 205.
His Power in Debate, 206.
Marten, Harry, 207.
Martin's Duel with Wilkes, 312.
Marvell, Andrew, 209.
Masked Battery, A, 287.
Maynooth College, 203.
Mean Nothing, Say Nothing, 114.
Measures, Not Men, 380.
Meddlesome Commons, 15.
Mediocrity, Respectable, 57.

Melbourne, Lord, 210.
Reply to Brougham, 212.
Members and their Children, 384.
Member, A, up a Ladder, 27.
Memory for Jokes, Imagination for Facts, 279.
Mendicant Proviso, A, 367.
Men, not Measures, 100.
Men turning their Backs upon themselves, 106.
Milton and Marvell, 210.
Milton's Imprisonment, 210.
Minister, An Unpopular, 94.
Minister of England, The, 235.
Ministerial Authority, 106.
Ministerial Fangs, 281.
Ministerial Ignorance, 297.
Minister's Duty, A, 166.
Minorities, Constant, 93.
Minority of One, 362.
Minute Gun Speech, A, 94.
MISCELLANEOUS, 315.
Miscount, A, 361.
Misleading the King, 125.
Mister-Most, 333.
Mobbing Members, 376.
Mob in the Irish House, 376.
Mob Orator, The, 228.
Modest Merit, 386.
Money Bills in the Lords, 198, 381.
Monasteries, The Suppressed, 14.
Montesquieu on the English Constitution, 2.
Moon, Visitor from the, 333.
More, Sir Thomas, 213.
Excites the Malice of Wolsey, 215.
Morpeth, Lord, 390.
Motion for Candles, 358.
Mr. Speaker, 173.
Murderer afraid of Ghosts, 140.
Museum of Curiosities, 231.
Mute Member, A, 162.
Mutilating the Journals, 22.
Mutually Suicidal, 143.
My Lord's Fat, 323.
Mystery of the Hat, 390.

N

Naming a Member, 373.
National Church, A, 165.
Nation, A, in the Gristle, 85.
Naval Appointments, 378.
Neat and Dear Relative, 241.
Neglect of the King's Summons, 7.
Neglect, Salutary, 85.
Newcastle, First Duke of, 216.
New Member, A, 220.
"New Timon," The, quoted, 144, 270.
Newspaper, Reading from a, 268.
Newspaper Speech, A, 311.
New World and the Old, 103.
Nicknames, Political, 132.
Nightcap, A, Wanted, 88.
Ninety Years Ago, 383.
Nodders and Noddees, 207.
Nod of Approbation, 176.
No Mistake, 306.
Non-attendance of Members, 360.
No, no! in the Lords, 178.
No Popery Riots, 168.
Norfolk, Election for, 200 Years Ago, 322.
North, Lord, 54, 218.
Out of Temper, 222.
Corrects Burke, 83.
His Fall, 222.
Not a Gentleman, 304.
Not a Wilkite, 312.
Note-taking, 350.
Not in his Line, 276.
Not in Office now, 172.
Not so Bad as he seemed, 212.
Nottingham Lambs, 337.
Not wanting Parts, 217.
Novelties, Mere, 273.
Nullâ Pallescere Culpâ, 264.

O

Oaths, Taking the, 299.
Oats and the Geese, 378.
Obnoxious Bill, An, in the Lords, 308.
Obstinate Silence, 215.
O'Connell, Daniel, 223.
Misreported, 224.
Duel with D'Esterre, 225.
Challenged by Peel, 247.
O'Connor, Feargus, 228, 274.
Odious Comparison, 363.
Office and the Grave, 388.
Office Levels Distinctions, 388.
Official Rhymes, 105.
Official Stature, 388.
Oftener-if-need-be's, 84.
Old Women, 365.

Old Sarum and Horne Tooke, 290.
Once and Always, 377.
Once Bit, Twice Shy, 190.
One Mind, 215.
Opening of Parliament by James I., 21.
Opposition, His Majesty's, 79.
Opposition on the Other Side of the Water, 222.
Optimism, 84.
Orator Hunt, 187.
Oratorical Perfection, 261.
Order, A Disorderly Rage for, 90.
Osborne, Bernal, 230.
Our Masters at Westminster, 36.
Our Sovereign, the People, 159.
Out-voted, not Out-argued, 93.
Oxfordshire Election, An, 324.

P

Paid Member, The Last, 209.
Palmerston, Lord, 231.
  Entrance into Parliament, 231.
  His Policy Described, 230.
  Attempt to Assassinate him, 232.
  A Three-decker, 233.
  Defends his Foreign Policy, 234.
  Dismissal from Foreign Secretaryship, 235.
  Foreign Policy Defended by Russell, 235.
  Début in the Premiership, 238.
  His Industry, 238.
Panegyric, Mistaken, 268.
Paper Duties Bill, The, 381.
Parasites, Fawning, 71.
Parenthetical Speech, A, 139.
PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY, ILLUSTRATIONS OF, 1.
Parliamentary Instinct, 141.
Parliamentary Training, 173.
Parliaments :—
  Antiquity of, 1.
  Barebone's, 6.
  Bats, 3.
  Convention, 32.
  De la Bond, 3.
  Diabolical, 3.
  First after the Conquest, 2.
  Lack-learning, 3.
  Long, Dissolution by Cromwell, 4.
  Mad, 2.
  Parliamentum Indoctum, 3.
  Partial Selection of, 6.
  Power to Convene, 32.
  Rump, 5.
  Unreported, 344.
Parodies, 224.
Paternal Caution, A, 240.
Paull, Duel with Sir F. Burdett, 81.
Pauper Proxies, 338.
Paying for Honours, 325.
Payment of Members, 36, 209.
Peace and War, 101.
Peas and Beans, 240.
Pease, J., 239.
Peel, Sir Robert, 240, 262.
  Attacked by Brougham, 71.
  Scene with Cobden, 134.
  Denunciation of Cobbett, 245.
  Challenge of O'Connell, 247.
  His Overthrow, 248.
  Guizot's Character of, 250.
Peeresses' Galleries, 349.
Peers, Creation of, 48.
Peers and Elections, 316.
Peers and their Robes, 369.
Peers sitting in the Commons, 30.
Peeresses Defeat the Peers, 349.
Pelham, Henry, 251.
Penurious Peers, 369.
Perceval, Spencer, 252.
  His Assassination, 253.
Perfection, 304.
Petition by Women, 392.
Petition, Chartist, (1848) 229.
Petition of Right, 137.
Petitions, 356.
Phases of a Witticism, 279.
Philosophical Prejudice, 147.
Physical Force, the last Resort, 152.
Pilloried, A Member, 17, 366.
Pious Subsidy, A, 11.
Pistols and Politics, 369.
Pitt, William, 53, 254, 276.
  Never was a Boy, 255.
  His First Speech, 256.
  His Personal Influence, 258.
  Classical Studies, 260.
  His Style, 261.
  Duel with Tierney, 289.
  Threatens to "Unwhig" Fox, 98.
  His Grave, 161.
Place and Power, Effect of, 106.
Plagiarising a Hustings Speech, 228.
Plagiarism, A, 197.
Plague Rag, A, in the House, 266.

Play-house Bill, The, 127.
Plays, Licensing, 374.
Pleasing better than Instructing, 127.
Pleasing Oratory, 205.
Plunket, Lord, 262.
Pluto's Tears, 286.
Pocket Majority, A, 47.
Political Bedfellows, 194.
Political Duelling Clubs, 369.
Political Virtue, 301.
Politics and the Muses, 97.
Pompey and the Stage, 127.
Pope-like Speech, A, 17.
Popularity, Evanescent, 121.
Popular Liberty, its Extension, 164.
Popular Representation, 198.
Porcine Illustration, A, 365.
Poulet, Lord William, 378.
Pound, What is a? 242.
Poverty and Patriotism, 280.
Power and Forbearance, 309.
Power of Genius, 175.
Precedent, Parliamentary, 384.
Precocious Criticism, 254.
Prediction, An Unfulfilled, 302.
Premier and the Commons, 307.
Premiers and their Faults, 301.
Preparation for Speaking, 261.
Preposterous Request, A, 340.
Press, Unfettered, 279.
Price of a City Member, 62.
Price of Votes, 332.
Pride's Purge, 5.
Prince Elector, The, 317.
Principles and Beards, 281.
Principles and Interests, 139.
Private History of Public Men, 308.
Privilege, The King Erasing a Declaration of, 22.
Privilege in the Commons, 124, 365.
Prizes in the Church, 379.
Professional Acumen, 262.
Promptitude, Ministerial, 102.
Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio, 210.
Prose *versus* Poetry, 97.
Prosperity Robinson, 132.
Prosy Speaker, A, 220.
Protection of Servants, 366.
Proud of him, We are all, 235.
Public and Private Opinion, 312.
Publication of Debates, 350.
Public Opinion, Power of, 66.
Pulling his Nose, 364.
Pull the Rogues out, 29.
Pulse in his Tongue, 383.
Pulteney's Motion, 297.
Pym, John, 265.

Q

Quaker, First, in Parliament, 239.
Quaker Secretary at War, 240.
Quakers, Cobbett and the, 132.
Qualification for Employment, 378.
Qualification for Office, 388.
Quarrel, A Just, 123.
Queen's Government must be Supported, 307.
Quelling Interruption, 158.
Quiet, Proclamations to Ensure, 8.
Quizzing a Bill out, 59.
Quotation, Completing a, 80, 192.
Quotation, Happy, 238.
Quotation, Inaccurate, 264.
Quotation, Use of, 165.

R

Raising a Storm, 142.
Ratting, 151.
Raw Material of Speeches, 190.
Reading Speeches, 382.
Ready for Anything, 312.
Rebellion and History, 375.
Rebels, The Opposition, 22.
Rebuking the House, 117.
Reciting a Collect in the House, 136.
Reconciliation Prevented, 261.
Reform, The First in Parliament, 31.
Reform, a Felon and a Creditor, 262.
Reform Bill (1831), Introduction of, 269.
Reform, Finality in, 243.
Reform Speech of Brougham, 75.
Refuge for the Destitute, 334.
Refusing to Retract, 150.
Register, Register, Register! 243.
Regrets, 179.
Religion, Dignity of, 85.
Religion, National, 165.
Remitting an Obligation, 139.
Render unto Cæsar, &c., 13.
Repeal, Introduction of, 223.
Repentant Patriot, A, 61.
Repenting of a Vote, 310.
Reply, A Brief, 212; a Crushing, 287.
Reporter, Defence of a, 224.

Reporters, their Power, 354.
Reporting, Parliamentary, 63.
Reporting in the Last Century, 351.
Representation an Expensive Luxury, 7.
Resources of War, 101.
Responsibility, Ministerial, 133.
Rest and be Thankful, 271.
"Restore the Heptarchy!" 101.
Retaliation, 155.
Retractation, Compelling, 113.
Retrospection, 263.
Revenge on a Minister, 290.
Revolution, The, 124.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 93, 375.
Rhetoric, Heedless, 148.
Rhyming Despatch, 105.
Right to be Heard, The, 361.
Rising Men, 255.
Rising Without a Friend, 196.
Rivals at Peace, 161.
Robinson, Prosperity, 132.
Robinson, Sir Thomas, 218.
Roebuck, Arthur, 267.
Roland for an Oliver, 207.
"Rolliad, The," 52, 191, 285.
Royal Appeal, A, 58.
Royal Interference, Disputing, 19.
Royal Phraseology, 365.
Royal Prerogative, 294.
Royal Speech Criticised, A, 280.
Rupert of Debate, The, 144.
Russell, Earl, 268, 314.
  Overthrow of his Administration, 237.
  His Judgment on himself, 272.

S

Sacrifice, A, 63.
Said it on Purpose, 314.
"St. Stephen's" (Bulwer's), quoted, 108, 228, 290.
Sale of Boroughs, 330.
Samples of the Sack, 336.
Scapegoat, A Ministerial, 267.
Scarecrow to the Houses, 286.
Scene, Fearful, in the Commons, 28.
Schomberg, Thanks of Parliament to, 384.
School for Rascals, 313.
School for Statesmen, 163.
Schoolmaster Abroad, The, 70.
Scorning an Advantage, 227.
Scotch Judges, Exclusion of, 372.
Scotch Terrier, Party of Two like a, 65.
Scott, Sir William, 273.
Scoundrels, Six Hundred and Fifty-eight, 143.
Scourge of the Country, 222.
Scribbling and Speaking, 281.
Seal-fishing, 77.
Seal, The Great, Stolen, 284.
Seals, The, given from the Heart, 151.
Secession of Members, 14.
Secret of Success, 205.
Secret Service Money, 218.
Secret, In the, 223.
Securing his Safety, 372.
Selden, John, 315.
Selling his Subjects, 125.
Selwyn, George, 375.
Senate of Lilliput, 352.
Sense and Nonsense, 312.
Sensibility opposed to Successful Speaking, 162.
Sergeant or Lieutenant, 341.
Servants, Protection of, 366.
Sets of Circumstances, 106.
Setting his House in Order, 40.
Shades of the Mighty Dead, 263.
Shambles of a Foreign Country, 125.
Shark and Wooden Leg, 190.
Sheep in Wolf's Clothing, 57.
Sheil, Richard Lalor, 273.
Shelburne, Earl of, 275.
Sheridan, R. B., 58, 261, 276.
  His Elaborate Wit, 279.
Sheriff Assaulted, 316.
Shippen and Walpole, 299.
Short Temper and Long Sword, 195.
Shower, A Wonderful, 224.
Shuttlecock of Reform, 194.
Sibthorp, Colonel, 280.
Sick Supporters, 297.
Sidmouth, Viscount, 57.
  Castlereagh Mobbed with, 109.
Silent and Eloquent, 282.
Silken Barons, 124.
Simple Ceremony, A, 324.
Sine quâ non, A, 185.
Single-Speech Hamilton, 179.
Singularly Correct, 368.
Sitting, A Two Hours' Speech, 176.
Sixpenny Freehold, A, 322.
Sketch, A, in the Gallery, 157.
Slavery, Instruments of, 123.

Slave, I will never die a, 154.
Slave Trade Motions, 308.
Sleeping over the Ruin of his Country, 219.
Sleeping through the Centuries, 220.
Slitting a Member's Nose, 137.
Sloven, The, 139.
Smelling-bottle, Parliamentary, 77.
Smothered War, 380.
Something worth taking Down, 262.
So Much for the Law of Nations, 108.
Sophism, A, 265.
Soporific Speech, A, 54.
Southey, Robert, 376.
South Sea Directors, Expulsion of, 44.
Sovereign People, The, 159.
Sowing Dragons' Teeth, 380.
Spanish Gratitude, 128.
Speaker, The :—
The First, 9.
Royal Rewards to, 11.
Coerced, 25.
Overcome, 25.
Refusing to put the Question, 26.
Defied by Chief-Justice Holt, 44.
His Wig, 58, 377.
His Warrant, 185.
Squinting, 294.
Vote of Censure on, 294.
Attacked, 362.
Quarrel with, 363.
Speaker Cornwall, 54.
Speaker of the Lords, 355.
Speakership of the Lords, peremptory offer, 180.
Speaking under Difficulties, 257.
Speak it I must, 311.
Spectacle of Woe, A, 24.
Speeches, Good, never without effect, 93.
Speech ordered to be Burnt, 27.
Spiritual Peers, 85.
Splitdevil, Dr., 293.
Splitting Freeholds, 321.
Spoiling a Martyr, 207.
Spoiling Nature, 58.
Spoke Once, 221.
Spring Rice and the Reporters, 354.
Stabbing the Constitution, 118.
Stage, The, as a Censor, 127.
Stage, The, and the Senate, 276.
Standing between the Living and the Dead, 310.
Starling, Proposal to Purchase a, 219.
Statesmen and Players, 127.
Stature, Value of, 388.
Statute Books doubled down, 123.
Staying the Plague, 310.
Stealing the Whigs' Clothes, 147.
Steele, Sir Richard, 281.
His Expulsion, 282.
Stem the Tide of Democracy, 144.
Stopping the Keyhole, 297.
Stopping the Poll, 326.
Stopping the Supplies, 252.
Stormy Petrel of Debate, The, 230.
Stowell, Lord, 273.
Strangers :—
Exclusion of, 86, 344.
Motion by Colonel Thompson, 346.
Motion by Mr. John O'Connell, 346.
Motion by Mr. Crawfurd, 347.
Strangers' Gallery, 349.
Strong Language, 312.
Students' Gallery, The, 175.
Sturdy Old Judge, A, 208.
Subscriptions to Race Meetings, 204.
Subterfuge, Parliamentary, 42.
Successful Silence, 59.
Sugar, Mr. Speaker! 113.
Suggestive Oratory, 190.
Superlative Praise, 191.
Supper Party without Supper, 91.
Sunday Observance Bills, 373.
Swearing-in an Irish Elector, 342.
Swearing the Peace, 371.
Syllogistic Reasoning, 265.

T

Tailors and Turncoats, 151.
Take Down his Words, 262.
Taking Liberties, 365.
Taking out the Sting, 132.
Taking the Oaths, 299.
Tampering with the House, 193.
Tatler, The, 281.
Taunts, Harmless, 172.
Taxation, Ignorant Impatience of, 106, 108.
Tea-Kettle Precedents, 147.
Tear 'em, 267.
Tell me where, 119.
Temple Bar, A Parliament from, 66.
Temptation, Resisting, 280.

Ten for One at a Division, 39.
Tenterden, Lord, 283.
That Thing called a Minister! 220.
The Jury of my Life, 149.
Thief in the Night, A, 165.
Thin House, To Make a, 207.
This is your first Duty, 360.
Three-decker, A, 233.
Three-man-beetle, A, 132.
Thurlow, Lord, 283.
Abashed, 284.
Asserts his Dignity, 287.
His Aspect, 287.
His Gush of Loyalty, 285.
His Manner in Debate, 287.
Thwarting the King, 214.
Tickling the Victims, 101.
Tierney, George, 289.
His Duel with Pitt, 289.
His Style in Debate, 289.
Titles and Trappings, 181.
Toby Philpotts, 198.
Tooke, John Horne, 290.
Top-boots at Court, 368.
Tory Physician and Whig Patient, 295.
Tottenham in his Boots, 388.
Tower of London a Common Law Principle, 108.
Townshend, Charles, 94, 293.
Translation, A Free, 186.
Trashy Bombast, 278.
Treacherous Voters, 333.
Treason, William IV. charges his Ministers with, 77.
Treaties of Peace, 182.
Trevor, Sir John, 294.
Trinity College Students in the House, 175.
Triumph of Mind over Matter, 174.
Troops at Elections, 340.
Truckle Bed of Honour, 194.
Tumult, Three Hours', 222.
Turk, A, upon his Shoulders, 69.
Turncoats and Tailors, 151.
Turning the Tables on O'Connell, 143.
Two in One, 89.
Two Men can Make a Party, 65.
Two Opinions, 312.

U

Unadorned Eloquence, 133.
Undebateable Subject, An, 104.
Undesigned Effect, 304.
Ungraceful Submission, 363.
Universal Suffrage, 315.
Unlimited Power Pernicious, 124.
Unready Speaker, An, 162.
Unsaying what was Said, 195.
Upsetting the Coach, 270.
Unreported Parliament, The, 344.
Unwhig Fox, Pitt's Threat to, 98.
Unwhig the Administration, 98.
Unwigging a Member, 152.
Unworthy Members, 373.

V

Vain Conversation, 130.
Verbal Criticism, 144.
Very Great and very Odd, 174.
Views and Prospects, 197.
Virtue in Politics, 183.
Voice and Vote, 362.
Voice, A powerful, 62.
Voices of the Dead, 135.
Voluble Member, A, 383.
Voting wisely, 383.
Vow, A, 283.
Vulgar Language, 365.

W

Wages, A Member suing for his, 8.
Wages to Members, 36; the last Recipient of, 209.
Waiting for the Signal, 176.
Waiting to Conquer, 349.
Walpole, Sir Robert, 62, 264, 295.
His Dread of Chatham, 114.
Attempt to Strangle him, 251.
Committal to the Tower, 295.
Plots against his Life, 298.
Ignorance of History, 297.
With the Spy, 298.
Two Drawbacks, 299.
His Schoolmaster's Prediction, 300.
Opinion of History, 300.
His Political Axiom, 301.
Lord Campbell's Character of him, 301.
Avoiding the Dinner-Bell, 373.
Washed out, The Notes, 224.
Weak Brother, A, 68.
Weakening Repetition, 153.

Weapons, Political, 94.
Wedderburne and Burke, 89.
Wedge in Loyal Feelings, 106.
Weeping for their Places, 286.
Wellington, Duke of, 302.
  Early Frivolity, 302.
  First Appearance in the Lords, 302.
  Characteristics of his Speeches, 303.
  Thanks of Parliament to, 384.
  His Difference with Huskisson, 305.
  Duel with Winchilsea, 306.
  Brougham's Objection to his Administration, 72.
We must all Vote for it, 308.
Wensleydale Life Peerage, 387.
Westminster Elections, 334.
What is a Pound? 242.
What's in a Name? 121.
Where Law ends Tyranny begins, 124.
"Whig" and "Tory," Origin of the Terms, 41.
Whig Birds and Peelites, 231.
Whigs Caught Bathing, The, 147.
Whip by the Court, A, 34.
Whipping the Whipper-in, 155.
Whitbread, Impromptu on, by Canning, 104.
Whitebait and Seal, 154.
White Hat, The, 187.
Who will laugh at Sugar? 113.
Wilberforce, William, 308.
  His Parliamentary Dinners, 309.
Wild Oats, 378.
Wilkes, John, 311.
  His Oratory, 311.
  Duel with Martin, 312.
  Patriotism, 312.
William IV. and his Cabinet, 75.
William IV. and Lord Melbourne, 210.
Williams, Speaker, 78.
Windham, William, 261, 313.
Winchilsea, Duel with Wellington, 306.
Wisdom, Great, 383.
Wisdom of our Ancestors, 173.
Wise Look, A, 287.
Witticism, Phases of a, 279.
Woke him too soon, 220.
Wolsey and the Commons, 214.
Women in Parliament, 391.
Women as Witnesses, 392.
Women Petitioners, 392.
Wonderful Debate, A, 95.
Wooden Oracle of the Treasury, 155.
Words and Deeds, 274.
Worst Chancellor of the Exchequer, 118.

Y

Yea and Nay, 383.
Yorkshire Election, A, 325.
Young Man from the Country, 231.
Your Principles, Sir? 340.
You said the other Thing before, 172.
You shall hear me, 147.
Youth and Age, 120.
Youth and Credulity, 123.

LONDON:
CASSELL, PETTER, AND GALPIN, BELLE SAUVAGE WORKS,
LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018